NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07955966 6

ZFHF
B2 1104

ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR ALTERTHUMSKUNDE

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT;

IN WHICH,

The Finite Nature of Sin is Argued,
Its Cause and Consequences as such;
The Necessity and Nature of Atonement;
And its glorious Consequences,

IN THE

Final Reconciliation of all Men

TO HOLINESS AND HAPPINESS.

BY HOSEA BALLOU,
Pastor of the Universalist Church and Society in Portsmouth, N. H.
"Author of Notes and Illustrations on the Parables,"
"Candid Review, &c."

"*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" St. Paul.
"*And there shall be no more death.*" St. John.

SECOND EDITION.

PORTSMOUTH N. H.
PRINTED AT THE ORACLE PRESS,
And for sale, wholesale and retail, at
CHARLES PEIRCE's
Bookstore, No. 5, Daniel-Street.

1812.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
789886 A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1935 L

NEW-HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT, TO WIT:

*****
SEAL.
*****

BE it remembered, that on this 10th day of February, in the thirty-sixth year of the Independence of the United States of America, The Rev. HOSEA BALLOU, of Portsmouth, in said District, hath deposited in this office, the title of a Book whereof he claims as author in the words following—to wit:

"A Treatise on Atonement; in which, the Finite Nature "of Sin is Argued, Its Cause and Consequences as such; "The Necessity and Nature of Atonement; And its glori-"ous Consequences, in the Final Reconciliation of all Men "to Holiness and Happiness. BY HOSEA BALLOU, Pastor of "the Universalist Church and Society in Portsmouth, N. H. "Author of Notes and Illustrations on the the Parables," "Candid Review, &c."

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." ST. PAUL.
"And there shall be no more death." ST. JOHN.

SECOND EDITION.

IN conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing copies of Maps, Charts, and other Books, to the authors and proprietors therein mentioned; and also an act supplementary to an act for the encouragement of learning by securing copies of Maps and Charts, and other Books, to the authors and proprietors therein mentioned, and extending the benefit thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."

R. CUTTS SHANNON, *Clerk of said District.*

A true copy of Record,

Attest, R. CUTTS SHANNON, *Clerk.*

A LETTER TO THE READER.

Christian Reader,

I KNOW it is frequently the case, when a person takes a new work in hand, he first casts his eye over the title page, and if he find no word on it that indicates perverse sentiments; and the name or denomination, of the author be agreeable, he may think of having patience to read it; but, being something in a hurry, passes slightly over the preface, supposing it to be of little consequence. But what sensations may have struck your mind, on reading the title of this book, and finding it to be the intention of the author to prove the doctrine of *universal holiness* and *happiness*, through the mediation and power of atoning grace, I cannot say; however, I would invite you to read, with candor and attention, not only this letter, but the whole of the work, and make up your judgment afterwards.

Many circumstances might be mentioned, which, in their association, have induced me to write and publish the following treatise; but I can say, with propriety, that the central object was that, in which I always find the most happiness, viz. to do what I find most necessary, in order to render myself most useful to mankind.

I have, from my early youth, been much in the habit of inquiring into the things of religion, and religious sentiments; and have, for a number of years, seen or thought I saw, great inconsistencies, in what has, for a long time, passed for orthodoxy in divinity.

WOR 20JUN34

The ideas, that sin is infinite, and that it deserves an infinite punishment; that the law transgressed is infinite, and inflicts an infinite penalty; and that the great Jehovah took on himself a natural body of flesh and blood, and actually suffered death on a cross, to satisfy his infinite justice, and thereby save his creatures from endless misery, are ideas which appear to me to be unfounded in the nature of reason, and unsupported by divine revelation. Such notions have, in my opinion, served to darken the human understanding and obscure the gospel of eternal life; and have rendered, what I esteem as divine revelation, a subject of discredit to thousands, who, I believe, would never have condemned the scriptures, had it not been for those gross absurdities being contended for, and the scriptures forced to bend to such significations. Christian authors and preachers have labored much to dissuade those whom they have caused to disbelieve the Christian religion, from their infidelity. But, in this case, the *salt* has lost its savor, become good for nothing, and is trodden under foot of men, who are *too sensible* to believe the unreasonable dogmas imposed on the world, either through error, or design, and sanctioned by tradition; and *too inattentive* to search the scriptures faithfully and impartially, whereby they might have learned that those errors were neither in them, nor supported by them. One particular object, therefore, in this work, is, if possible, to free the scripture doctrine of atonement from those incumbrances which have done it so much injury; and open a door, at least, for the subject to be investigated on reasonable grounds, and by fair argument.

If we admit that our Creator made us reasonable beings, we ought, of course, to believe, that all the

truth which is necessary for our belief, is not only reasonable, but reducible to our understandings.

In order to come at the subject of atonement, so as to have light continually shining along the path which I intend to occupy, I found it necessary to show my reasons for not admitting the doctrine, on the ground on which it is usually argued; to do which, I found I must, of necessity, show, that the common notion of the *infinity* of *sin* is unfounded in truth; and of course, every consequence deducible from such an error, equally unfounded and unsupported. It may seem not a little strange, to some of my readers, that I dispute the *infinity* of the law against which sin is committed; as all unholiness must be, either in union, or disunion, with the eternal law of holiness and divine purity. But if the reader will take a little pains to observe particularly, it will appear plain, that no being can stand amenable to a law above his capacity. And as the creature is *finite*, in his earthly character, in which character only, he is, or can be a sinner, it is not reasonable to say, that he stands amenable to an infinite law. But, as the reader will find, in this work so much of the divine law of perfection, as the creature obtains a knowledge of, (which, in comparison to the whole, is no more than a shadow to a substance) is the law which he violates by his sin. And though we may speak of the sin of ignorance, it can amount to no more than the production of a virtuous intention thwarted by ignorance, or the same principle by which the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, gratify their various inclinations and appetites. And I do not think my reader will wish to have me prove that such sin is not infinite.

In my argument on the cause, or origin of sin, I thought it necessary to hint a little on the general idea of the subject, endeavoring to show the want of propriety in what is commonly contended for; and I have sought for the rise of unholy temptations in the constitutions of earthly and finite beings. I have endeavored, also to trace the causes and consequences of sin (as sin) so as to determine the *finite* nature of *all* which belongs to sin as *cause* and *consequence*. In any sense, in which it can be said that GOD is the *author* of *any thing whatever*, in that sense of speaking, *it cannot be sin*. And in any sense, in which any action, or event, can be said to be *endless*, in its *consequences*, GOD *must be considered* the *author* of it.

In all the statements which I have made of the doctrinal ideas of others, I have been careful to state no more than what I have read in authors, or heard contended for in preaching, or conversation; and if I have, in any instance, done those ideas any injustice, it was not intended. The reason why I have not quoted any author, or spoken of any denomination, is, I have not felt it to be my duty, nor my inclination, to write against any name, or denomination in the world; but my object has been, what I pray it may ever be, to contend against error, wherever I find it; and to receive truth, and support it, let it come from what quarter it may. For the sake of ease, however, in writing, I reasoned with my *opponent*, *opposer*, or *objector*, meaning no one in particular, but any one who uses the arguments, and states the objections, which I have endeavored to answer. It is very probable, that some may think me too ironical, and, in many instances, too severe, on what I call error. But I find it very difficult to expose error, so as to be understood by all, without

carrying, in many instances, my arguments in such a form as may not be agreeable to those who believe in what I wish to correct. I confess I should have been glad to have written, on all my inquiries, so as not to have displeased any, but to have pleased all, could I have done it, and accomplished my main design; but this I was persuaded would be difficult. I have, therefore paid particular attention to nothing but my main object; depending on the goodness of my reader to pardon what may be disagreeable, in manner or form, as inadvertencies.

What I have written on the subject of the *Trinity*, is mainly to show the reader in what light I view the Mediator, that my general ideas of atonement may be the easier understood. And though I think my objections and arguments, against the common idea of three distinct persons in the Godhead, who are *equal* in *power* and *glory*, to be unanswerable; yet, it was not my intention to attend to a full refutation of those ideas, as I think that has frequently been done, and well done.

The opposers of universalism have generally written and contended against the doctrine, under an entire mistaken notion of it. They have endeavored to show the absurdity of believing that men could be received into the *kingdom* of *glory* and *righteousness*, *in their sins;* which *no Universalist ever believed.* In this work, I have endeavored to make as fair a statement, of what I call universalism, as I was able; and it stands on such ground, that the *propriety* of it can no more be disputed, than the *propriety* of *universal holiness* and *reconciliation* to *God.* Perhaps the reader will say, he has read a number of authors on the doctrine of universalism, and finds considerable difference in their systems. That I acknowledge is true; but

all agree in the main point, viz. that *universal holiness* and *happiness* is the *great object* of the *gospel plan.* And as for the different ways in which individuals may believe this work will be done, it proves nothing against the main point; but proves, what I wish could be proved concerning *all* other *Christian denominations*, that they have set up no standard of their own, to cause all to bow to, or be rejected as heretics. We feel our own imperfections; we wish for every one to seek with all his might after wisdom; and let it be found where it may, or by whom it may, we humbly wish to have it brought to light, that all may enjoy it; but do not feel authorized to condemn an honest inquirer after truth, for what he believes different from a majority of us.

A few sentences, which the reader will find towards the close of this work, which have reference to a punishment after death, may cause him to desire more of my ideas on the subject.

The doctrine of punishment after death, has, by many able writers, been contended for; some of whom have argued such punishment to be endless, and others limited. But it appears to me that they have taken wrong ground who have endeavored to support the latter, as well as those who have labored to prove the former. They have both put great dependence on certain figurative and parabolical expressions, or passages of scripture, which they *explain*, so as to cause them to allude to such an event. It appears to me, that they have not sufficiently attended to the nature of sin, so as to learn its punishment to be produced from a law of *necessity*, and not a law of *penalty*. Had they seen this, they would also have seen, that a perpetuity of punishment must be connected with an equal con-

tinuance of sin, on the same principle that an effect is dependant on its cause. Who in the world would contend, that a man, who had sinned one year, could expiate his guilt, by sinning five more, with greater turpitude of heart? State the punishment, say a thousand years, for a sinner who dies in unbelief. What is it for? Say for his incorrigibleness in this world. Well, does he commit sin during these thousand years? Surely, or he could not be miserable. Then I ask, if it take a thousand years punishment in another world, to reward the sinner for, say fifty years of sin in this, how long must he be punished, afterwards, for the sin he commits during the thousand years? The punishment, or sufferings, which we endure, in consequence of sin, is not a dispensation of any *penal law*, but of the *law* of *necessity*, in which law, as long as a cause continues, it produces its effects. Therefore, to prove a man will suffer condemnation for sin, at thirty, forty, or fifty years of age, it would be necessary to prove that he would be a sinner at that time, or those times. So, in order to prove that a man will be miserable, after this mortal life is ended, it must first be proved that he will sin in the next state of existence.

It has been argued, by many, that the doctrine of future punishment, or misery, is a necessary doctrine to dissuade men from committing sin, which surely surprises me. To tell a person who is in *love* of *sin*, that if he does not immediately refrain, he will have to *continue* in *sin* for a long time, would be *true*, *besure;* but would be void of force to dissuade him from what he is in *love* with. I believe, that as long as men sin, they will be miserable, be that time longer or shorter; and that as soon as they cease from sin, they begin to experience divine enjoyment.

The scripture speaks of the *times* of the *restitution* of *all things*, but does not inform us their number, or their duration. It also speaks of the *fulness* of *times*, but gives us no date, or duration of them.

I have not stated so many objections against the doctrine which I have labored to prove, as many of my readers may wish I had, nor so many as I should have been glad to, was it not for swelling the work to more of an expensive size. But I have stated, and endeavored to answer the most frequent objections, and those on which my opposers put the most dependance ; and I should have taken great satisfaction in communicating many more arguments, both from reason and scripture, in favor of universal holiness and happiness, than I have, was it not for the reason assigned in the other case. However, if those objections which I have taken notice of, are answered to the reader's satisfaction, other scriptures, generally used as argument against the salvation of all men, will not be hard to be understood, as not unfavorable to the doctrine. And as for the proofs which I have deduced from scripture and reason, I believe them entirely conclusive ; but if not, more of the same kind would not be.

The reason I have not particularly explained those parables of the New Testament which I have had occasion to notice, in this work, is, my Notes, of which, mention is made on the title page of this book, are before the public, and contain my ideas on most of the parables spoken by Christ.

A question may be asked by many, which has labored much in my mind, respecting the propriety of publishing books on divinity, when we profess to believe in the book called the *Bible*, that it contains all which we mean to communicate as truth, in matters of religion ; on which question I am determin-

ed for myself, that the gospel of Jesus Christ would have been better understood, had the Bible been the only book ever read on the subject. And though I doubt not but many authors have done great justice to those subjects on which they have written, and the light of the scriptures have, by such means, been caused to shine; yet, by others, it has been greatly obscured. And had one half the attention been paid to the *Bible* which has been paid to those authors who have written upon it, it would, in my opinion, have been incomparably better for Christendom. But, on account of errors imbibed, in consequence of erroneous annotations, it may be argued, that it is now necessary to write and publish correct sentiments, by the same parity of reasoning as we argue the necessity of those means to restore health, which are not necessary to continue it.

To the short exhortation, with which the believer in universalism will meet, in this work, he is humbly invited to pay strict attention; as no faith, however true it may be, can be of any real service to the believer, unless it be accompanied with the spirit and life of that truth in which it is grounded. The greater the beauty of a person, the more lamentable his death. The more divinity there is in any faith, the greater is the pity it should not be alive. "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

My brethren in the ministry will not think it assuming, that I have spoken of the necessity of our paying strict attention to the stewardship into which God by his grace hath put us; as it was not written so much to instruct, as to show the brethren my faith; that they may see the ground on which I stand; know the manner in which I contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; and feel for

me the same fellowship which I feel for them. You may regret that my ideas were not more correct, in many instances, and think the great subject on which I have written, might have obtained better justice from some more experienced writer; in which you have the same ideas with myself. But in this you may be satisfied, that I have written as I now think and believe, without leaning to the right, or to the left, to please or displease. I have been often solicited to write and publish my general ideas on the gospel, but have commonly observed to my friends, that it might be attended with disagreeable consequences, as it is impossible to determine whether the ideas which we entertain at the present time are agreeable to those which we shall be under the necessity of adopting after we have had more experience; and knowing, to my satisfaction, that authors are very liable to feel such an attachment to sentiments which they have openly avowed to the world, that their prejudice frequently obstructs their further acquisitions in the knowledge of the truth; and even in cases of conviction, their own self-importance will keep them from acknowledging their mistakes: And having some knowledge of my own infirmities, I felt the necessity of precaution, which I have no reason to believe, is, or has been injurious.

I have had, for some time, an intention to write a treatise on this subject, but thought of deferring it until more experience might enable me to perform it better, and leisure give me opportunity to be more particular. But the consideration of the uncertainty of life was one great stimulus to my undertaking it at this time, added to a possibility of living to be informed with what success it meets in the world, and of having an opportunity to correct whatever I might, in my future studies, find incorrect, were not the smallest causes of my undertaking it.

It has often been said, by the enemies of the doctrine for which I have contended, that it would do to live by, but not to die by; meaning that it would not give the mind satisfaction, when sensible it was about to leave a mortal, for an immortal state. As to the truth of the assertion, I cannot positively say, that moment has not yet been experienced by me; and, as those who make the remark have never believed the doctrine, I cannot see how they should know any better than I do. Thus much I can say, I believe I have seen, and often heard of persons rejoicing in the doctrine, in the last hours of their lives; but I do not build my faith on such grounds. The sorrows, or the joys of persons, in their last moments, prove nothing to me of the truth of their general belief. A jew, who despises the name of Christ, from the force of his education, may be filled with comfortable hopes, in his last moments, from the force of the same education. I have no doubt but a person may believe, or pretend to believe, in the doctrine of universal salvation, when he knows of no solid reason for his belief, but has rather rested the matter on the judgment of those in whom he has placed more confidence, than he has in reality, on the Saviour of the world; and I think it very possible, that such Universalists may have strange and unexpected fears, when the near approach of death, or any other circumstance, should cause them to think more seriously, on so weighty a subject.

There must be a time, with all men, whose faith and confidence are placed in any thing short of divine mercy, that will be extremely trying; and all the education in the world cannot prevent it.

What my feelings might be, concerning the doctrine which I believe, was I called to contemplate it on a *death bed*, I am as unable to say, as I am what

I may think of it a year hence, should I *live* and be in *health.* But I am satisfied, beyond a doubt, that if I live a year longer, and then find cause to give up my present belief, that I shall not feel a consciousness of having professed what I did not *sincerely believe ;* and was I called to leave the world and my *writings* in it, and at the *last hour* of my *life* should find I had *erred*, yet I am satisfied, that I should *possess* the *approbation* of a *good conscience* in *all* I have *written.*

Therefore, though sensible of my imperfections, yet enjoying great consolation in believing the doctrine for which I have argued, in the following work, and in the enjoyment of a good conscience, I submit the following pages to a generous and candid public, praying for the *blessing* of the God whom I *serve*, on the *feeble endeavors* of the *most unworthy whom* he hath *called* as a *servant* of *all men.*

THE AUTHOR.

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT.

IN this Treatise on Atonement, I shall confine myself to three general inquiries. 1st Of Sin. 2d. Of *Atonement* for Sin. 3d. Of the *Consequences* of *Atonement* to *Mankind.* These particulars may be represented by a *disorder*; the *remedy* for the *disorder*, and the *health* enjoyed in consequence of a *cure.*

And 1st. Of sin, which, for the sake of ease, I subdivide as follows. 1. Its *nature.* 2. Its *cause.* And 3. Its *effects.*

And first of the *nature* of sin. Sin is the violation of a law which exists in the mind, which law is the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good. This law is transgressed, whenever, by the influence of temptation, a good understanding yields to a contrary choice. Where a law exists, it presupposes a legislature, whose intention, in legislation, must be *thwarted*, in order for the law to take cognizance of sin. This legislature, in all moral accountable beings, is a capacity to understand, connected with

the causes and means of knowledge, which standing or existing, on finite and limited principles, will justify my supposition, that sin, in its nature, ought to be considered finite and limited, rather than infinite and unlimited, as has, by many, been supposed.

By offering my reasons against the infinity of sin, I shall open to an easy method of showing it to be finite. The supposition that sin is infinite, is supported, or rather pretended to be supported, on the consideration of its being committed against an *infinite law*, which is produced by an *infinite legislature*, who is God *himself*. I have before observed, and I think justly, that the intention of a legislature, in legislation, must be *thwarted*, in order for the law, to take *cognizance* of *sin*. Now if God, in a direct sense of speaking, be the legislator of the law which is *thwarted* by *transgression*, in the same direct sense of speaking, his *intentions* in *legislation* are *thwarted*. With eyes open, the reader cannot but see, that if sin be infinite because it is committed against an infinite law, whose author is God, the design of Deity must be *abortive ;* to suppose which, brings a cloud of darkness over the mind, as *intense* as the supposition is *erroneous*. It cannot with any propriety be supposed, that any rational being can have an intention contrary to the knowledge which he possesses. Was a resolve brought into the State legislature to be passed into an act, it would be very unlikely to succeed, providing the legislature knew that the intention of the act would utterly fail. It is possible, and very frequently the case, that *imperfect* beings desire contrary to their knowledge ; but this, in every instance, is *proof* and often the cause of their *misery*. In such cases, misery rises to an exact proportion to the strength of desire. Now to reason justly, we must conclude, that

if God possess *infinite* wisdom, he could never intend any thing to take place, or be, that will not take place, or be; nor that which is, or will be, not to be, at the time when it is. And it must be considered erroneous to suppose that the *Allwise* ever desired any thing to take place, which, by his wisdom, he knew would not; as such a supposition must, in effect, suppose a degree of *misery* in the *eternal mind*, *equal* to the *strength* of his *fruitless desire!* Were this the case, all the misery to which mortals are subject, bears not the thousandth part of the proportion to the miseries of the Divine Being, as the smallest imaginable atom does to the weight of the ponderous globe; providing, at the same time, the idea of infinity is attached to Deity! Again, if we admit of a disappointment to the Supreme Being, even in the smallest matter of consideration, it follows, that we have no satisfactory evidence whereby to prove that any thing, at present, in the whole universe, is as the Supreme intended. All the harmonies of nature, which to the eye of wondering man, are so convincing of the existence of that power, wisdom and goodness which he adores, may have continued their laws in active force much longer than God intended; brought into existence millions of beings more than were contemplated in creation; and by this time become a perfect nuisance to the general plan of the Almighty. The admission of the error refuted, would sink the mind to the nether parts of moral depravity, where darkness reigns with all its horrors.

The above arguments are introduced, to show the absurdity of admitting a violation of the intention of the Supreme Legislator.

I now turn on the other side, and admit, as a fact, what I have sufficiently refuted, viz. that the *inten-*

tions of *God* as a *Supreme Legislator* are *violated* by the *sin* of *finite beings ;* but must beg leave to inform the reader that the proposition will by no means afford the intended consequences ; but yields me an argument in favor of the *finite* nature of *sin*, which I do not want, and of which I shall make no other use than to *explode* the *proposition itself.* If any intention of Deity were ever thwarted, it proves, without evasion, that he is not *infinite ;* if so, his *will*, or *intention*, *cannot* be *infinite ;* and, therefore, the consequences intended by the proposition are forever lost, as they exist only upon the supposition of his being *infinite.* If it be argued, that the intentions of Deity, as a legislator, are violated, not strictly in an *infinite sense*, but in some *subordinate degree*, it is giving up the ground contended for, to all intents ; for, if the *intention violated*, be not *infinite*, the *sin* of *violating* it, cannot be *infinite.*

Again, if sin be infinite and unlimited, it cannot be superseded by any principle or being in the universe ; for goodness cannot be more than *infinite*, neither is there a degree for Deity to occupy above it. And it may be further argued, that the admission of the error refuted, would be a denial of any *Supreme Being* in the universe ; for, as Deity does not supersede sin, he cannot be *superior* to that which is *equal* to *himself.*

Again, I further inquire, can that be considered as an *infinite evil*, which is *limited* in its *consequences* ? The answer must be in the negative. If sin be an *infinite evil*, and *infinite* in its *consequences*, as an *evil*, not only all created beings must suffer endlessly by it, but God himself can never cease to experience the torment-giving power of that which he is unable to avoid ! I say more, if sin be *infinite* and *unlimited*, for it must be, *unlimited*, if it be *infinite*,

it follows that there is no such principle in the universe, as any one property which we are *wont* to *attribute* to the Almighty; for, if once we admit a principle of *divine justice* to have an existence, it is granted that sin is bounded by it, and therefore cannot be infinite; and it is a fact that sin can no where exist, only where it can be compared with justice. Again, it ought not to be supposed, that the intentions of Deity were ever violated, if we admit, at the same time, that he had power to avoid such violation. And who, in their senses, will say, that, that which is unavoidable by God, is avoidable by man?

Enough, undoubtedly, is said, to show the egregious mistake of supposing sin to be infinite; and more need not be written on the subject, were it not by some contended, that Job xxii. 5, is in full proof of the *infinity* of sin. "Is not thy wickedness great? and thine iniquities infinite?" In answer to this passage, I need only turn the reader to chap. xlii. 7, "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said unto Eliphaz the Timnite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." Observe, kind reader, the words which are brought to prove the infinity of sin, are neither the words of God, nor of one whom he approved; but they are the words of that Timnite, against whom God's anger was kindled, for not speaking the thing that was right.

Once more, and I close this part of my query.—If sin be infinite in its nature, there can be no one sin greater than another. The smallest offence against the good of society, is equal to *blasphemy* against the Holy Ghost. If what we call a small crime, be not infinite, the greatest cannot be, provid-

viding there is any proportion between the great and the small. Are not the words of Christ, Matt. xii. 31, where he speaks of sins and blasphemies that should be forgiven unto men, and of blasphemies that should not be forgiven men, a sufficient evidence that some sins are more heinous than others? Again, 1 Epistle of John, v. 16, where some sins are said to be not unto death, and some unto death, &c.

Now, admitting the matter proved, that sin is not infinite, it follows, of course, that it is proved to be finite. However, we will now attend to the direct evidences of the finite nature of sin.

The law which takes cognizance of sin is not infinite, it being produced by the legislature which I have before noticed, viz. a capacity to understand, connected with the causes and means of knowledge. In order for a law to be infinite, the legislature must be so; but man's ability to understand is finite, and all the means which are in his power for the acquisition of knowledge are finite; all his knowledge is circumscribed, and the law produced by such causes must be like them, not infinite but finite. An infinite law would be far above the capacity of a finite being, and it would be unreasonable to suppose man amenable to a law above his capacity. All our knowledge of good and evil is obtained by comparison. We call an action evil by comparing it with one which we call good. Were it in our power to embrace all the consequences that are connected with our actions in our intentions, our meanings would seldom be what they now are. Had it been so with the brethren of Joseph, when they sold him to the Ishmaelites, that they then knew all the consequences which would attend the event, they would not have meant it, as they did, for evil, but seeing with perfectly unbeclouded eyes their own

salvation, and that of the whole family of promise' they would have meant it for good, as did the Almighty who superintended the affair. Now the act of selling Joseph was sin, in the meaning of those who sold him ; but it was finite, considered as sin, for it was bounded by the narrowness of their understandings, limited by their ignorance, and circumscribed by the wisdom and goodness of him who meant it for good. If this sin had been infinite, nothing that we can justly call good, could have been the consequence ; but whoever read the event without seeing that the best of consequences were connected with it ?

The promised seed, in whom all the families of the earth are to be blessed, according to the word of promise to Abraham, was to descend from that family which was preserved through seven years of famine, as a consequence of the good intended in that event. And who but God can comprehend the infinite good contained in the all glorious plan of meditorial grace ? We then see, that what in a limited sense, we may justly call sin, or evil, in an unlimited sense is justly called good. We say, of the top of yonder mountain, it is exceedingly high ; and of yonder valley, it is low ; and this we justly say, by comparing one with the other, in respect to the centre of our earth. But the moment we extend our thoughts to comtemplate the millions of worlds in unbounded space, and take the whole in one grand system, the idea of high and low is lost. So is sin finished, when, by divine grace, our understandings are enlightened, and we hear our spiritual Joseph say, "Grieve not yourselves, ye *meant* it unto *evil*, but God *meant* it unto *good*." It will be granted, on all sides, that no action unconnected with design ought to be considered sin ; it is then an evil intention

that constitutes an evil action. For instance, a man exerting himself to the utmost of his abilities to save the life of his neighbor, accidentally takes his life, the consequence is not the guilt of murder, but heart-aching grief for the loss of his friend. Again, a man exerting himself with all his ingenuity and strength to take the life of his neighbor, misses his intention and saves his life from immediate danger; the consequence is not the approbation of a good conscience for having saved the life of his neighbor, but condemnation for having designed his death, and perhaps mortification in his disappointment. By these instances, the reader may see, that no act can be determined to be morally good, or evil, by the consequences which follow, but only by the disposition, or intention, which the actor possesses when the act is done. Then, in order for the sin to be infinite, the intention of the transgressor must be infinite, embracing all the consequences that can ever arise from what he does; but this is never the case with finite beings. We never know all the effects or consequences, that will be produced from the smallest of those acts which we do in time. It is the immediate consequences which we have in our power to calculate upon, and in them we are often deceived. Our acts as moral accountables, are all limited to the narrow circle of our understanding; therefore our goodness is limited, being of the finite nature of our knowledge, and our sin is in the same finite and limited circle. It may be argued very justly, that as no finite cause can produce an infinite effect, no finite creature can commit an infinite sin; and as every effect must stand in relation to its cause, so man being finite, cannot be the cause of an evil which does not stand in relation to man the finite cause. Should the reader suppose, that my admit-

ting the act of selling Joseph was attended with unlimited consequences, in opposition to my sentiment wherein I limit all actions which originate in finite causes; I reply, as the act of selling Joseph respected the purpose of Deity, and the plan of grace, those who sold him do not stand as even the *shadow of a cause*, but only as instruments, by which God effected his own divine and gracious purpose. Perhaps the reader by this time, is ready to say, according to this reasoning, there can be no such things as *real evil* in the universe. If, by real evil, be meant something that ought not to be, in respect to all the consequences which attend it, I cannot admit of its existence; for I cannot conceive of any productive cause whatever, that can be, strictly speaking, limited in its consequences. For instance, the first transgression of man, no one can suppose, has ceased in its consequences; for, from that cause, the knowledge of good and evil exists in moral beings, and when the effects of that knowledge will cease, I cannot imagine. If it be objected, that to call that a sin which produces an infinite continuance of good effects, must be absurd; I say, in reply, the objection comes too late; for it is already proved, that the consequences of an act do not determine whether the act be good or evil.

I have, in the foregoing queries, spoken of that kind of sin which is productive of remorse; however, we read, besure, of the sin of ignorance, see Num. xv. 27, &c.; but this I conceive to be more of a legal than of a moral nature, and it is sometimes called error; it is in a thousand instances productive of sorrow and disappointment, but never of guilt. If we consider the Jews under their law, or the Gentiles, who, the apostle says, were a law unto themselves, we shall find them exposed to guilt, on

the same principles. Therefore, moral transgression must vary, as the knowledge and understanding of men vary, in various circumstances.

If it be thought by the reader, that I have passed over the spirit of the law, which is love to God in a superlative degree, and an esteem for our neighbors equal to that which we have for ourselves; I answer, I have not altogether passed by it. This law of divine love is that infinite law of perfection, which is higher than our capacities extend, in a finite state. The law given to Israel, literally speaking, was only a shadow of the spirit of love; and all our knowledge of moral holiness is but a faint resemblance of that sublime rectitude from which the most upright of the sons of men are at a great distance.

Having hinted so much on the nature of sin as to make the subject plain to the reader's understanding, I will now pass to an inquiry into its cause, or origin.

The origin of sin has, among christians in general, been very easily accounted for; but in a way, I must confess, that never gave me any satisfaction, since I came to think for myself on subjects of this nature. A short chimerical story from the bard, Milton, has given perfect satisfaction to millions, respecting the introduction of moral evil into the moral system which we occupy. The substance of the account is, sometime before the creation of man, the Almighty created multitudes of spiritual beings, called angels: Some of these creatures of God were much higher in dignity and authority than others, but all perfectly destitute of sin, or moral turpitude. One dignified above all the rest, stood Prime Minister of the Almighty, cloathed with the highest missive power, and clad with garments of primeval light; obsequious to nothing but the high behest of

his Creator, he discharged the functions of his office with a promptitude and dignity, suited to the eminency of his station, and to the admiration of celestial millions. But when it pleased Jehovah to reveal the brightness of his glory and the image of the Godhead in humanity, he gave forth the command, see Psalm xcvii. 7. "Worship him, all ye gods." And Heb. i. 6. "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." Lucifer, Son of the Morning, (as Christians have called him) surprised at the idea of worshipping any being but God himself, looked on the Son with ineffable disdain, and in a moment grew indignant, brushed his strongest pinions, and waved his wings for the throne of God, challenged supremacy with the Almighty, and cast his eye to the sides of the north as a suitable place to establish his empire. Legions of spirits followed this chief in rebellion, and formed a dangerous party, in the kingdom of the Almighty. The Son of God was invested with full power as Generalissimo of Heaven, to command the remaining forces, against the common enemy. And in short, after many grievous battles between armies of contending spirits, where life could not, in the least, be exposed, Lucifer and his party were driven out of Heaven, leaving it in peace, though in a great measure, depopulated!

God having created the earth, and placed the first man and woman in a most happy situation of innocence and moral purity, without the smallest appetite for sin, or propensity to evil, the arch Apostate enviously looked from his fiery prison, to which he was consigned by the command of the Almighty, and beholding man placed in so happy a situation, and in a capacity to increase to infinite multitudes,

by which the kingdom of Heaven would be enlarged, was determined to crop this tree in the bud.—He, therefore, turns into a serpent, goes to the woman and beguiles her, gets her to eat of a fruit which God had forbidden, by which mean he introduced sin into our system.

I have not been particular in this sketch, but it contains the essence of the common idea. I shall now put it under examination, looking diligently for the propriety of accounting for the origin of moral evil in this way.

And first, of this memorable rebellion in heaven! It seems, that this rebel angel was always obedient to the commands of his Maker, until the hour of his fall; that there was not the least spot of pollution in him, until he felt the emotions of pride, which lifted him above submission to the Son of God. This being the case, I ask, was this angel ignorant of the real character of the Son, whom he was commanded to worship? If he were not, but knew it to be no other than the true Eternal, his Creator, manifested in a nature which Jehovah created; if he loved his Maker as he ought to do, which none will pretend to dispute; he would have worshipped him with due reverence, the moment he made the discovery and heard the command: This no person in his senses will dispute. If he did not know the real character whom he was commanded to worship, had he complied, he would have worshipped, he knew not what. And nothing can be more absurd, than to suppose that infinite wisdom would command his creatures to worship ignorantly. I ask, further, could purity produce impurity; or moral holiness, unholiness? All answer, no. Was not the angel holy in every faculty? Was not the command, for him to worship the Son, holy and

just? All answer, yes. Then from such causes, how was sin produced? The reader will easily see, the question cannot be answered. Now, reader, be so kind as to turn to the scripture, to which I have referred you on this subject, and see if we have any authority for saying, that either gods or angels refused to worship, when commanded. "Again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." That this first begotten is Christ, no doubt will be entertained. But when was he brought into the world? before, or since the first transgression of man? Since, most certainly. Then, supposing millions of angels had sinned at that time, it could have had no consequence productive of man's transgression, as a cause cannot be posterior to its effects. Therefore, to suppose, that those angels who never sinned until long after man became a transgressor, were the instigators of what is called the fall, discovers a want of calculation. And further, what authority have we for believing that the command was disobeyed? We find nothing connected with either passage, viz. that in Psalms, or that in Hebrews, which intimates a refusal among the gods, or angels. And I see no need of supposing, that by gods, in one text, or by angels in the other, any other beings are intended than men. In respect to the command for all the gods to worship him, I observe, "they were called gods to whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken." And the command, for all the angels of God to worship, stands on this proper ground; by angels, are meant messengers, who are employed by God, for the information of their fellow men;—but as all those messengers, or ministers, were inferior to the "Messenger of the covenant," whom

the Lord promised to send unto Jerusalem, it was suitable to show his superiority, by giving such a token, in the scriptures, as commanding all the angels to worship him. There is another passage in the xivth of Isaiah, 12, &c. " How art though fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! for thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend unto heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will set also upon the mount of the congregation in the *sides* of the *north*," &c.

" Here," I have been told, we have a particular account of the sin which Satan committed in Heaven." But as there is nothing in this passage, or its connexions, that has reference to any other creature or being, as Lucifer, Son of the Morning, than the King of Babylon, I shall say but little upon it. Observe, the question is asked, How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning? How art thou cut down to the ground, who *didst* weaken the nations? This Lucifer weakened the nations before he fell, but was unable to weaken them afterwards. He said in his heart, he would ascend unto Heaven. Was this the sin of Satan, as is generally supposed? Was he not already in Heaven? How then should he say in his heart, I will ascend unto Heaven? I will not trouble the reader with any thing so vague as the vulgar application of this scripture, only enough to show that it had no such meaning. The King of Babylon is pointed out, in this prophecy, as exalting his throne above the *stars* of God, which, in a figurative sense, undoubtedly meant his exalting himself by the reduction of the Jews, who are figuratively called the *stars* of God.

Again, this angel of light must have been very ignorant of the power and goodness of the Almighty, in order to have possessed a thought, that to rebel against him could be of any possible advantage, or that he could have carried and maintained a contest with him. If he were as ignorant as all this, the inhabitants of *Heaven* must have been extremely uncultivated, in that age of eternity, and no great ornament to a place so much famed for glory and grandeur. If Heaven, which is said to be God's throne, be, or ever were inhabited by defectable beings, the place itself must be a defectable place; and why the Almighty should take up his special abode in a defectable place, surrounded by defectable beings, I cannot imagine. But I pass on—

After Satan was turned out of Heaven, he saw no possible way to injure his adversary, only by contamniating his creatures, which he had just made, and placed in the happy situation before described. Here observe, the matter appears strange. Did God not know the evil disposition of Satan? Had he forgotten the awful difficulty but just settled? Or would he leave an innocent Lamb to the ferocity of a bear robbed of her whelps? God had driven Satan from Heaven, from his own presence, but left him at loose ends to prey on his tender offspring, whom he had just left in a defenceless situation, on this ball of earth! What would appear more unnatural and shocking, than for a father to chase his enemy out at his door, but leave him to slay his defenceless children in the street? I shall, after what I have observed, beg liberty to say, I am so far from believing any such story respecting the cause of sin, that I have not even the shadow of evidence, from scripture or reason, to support the sentiment. But I have been told, that man, standing in a state

of sinless purity, could not have fallen from that rectitude, unless there had been some sinful being to have tempted him. Admitting there is any force in this observation, it stands as directly against the fall of Satan, without a sinful temptation, as it does against man's transgression, without a tempter. Was man more pure, before he sinned, than that holy angel in Heaven? If not, how could that angel sin, without a temptation, easier than man, who was made in a lower grade? But supposing we should admit that God commanded an angel to worship his Son Jesus, and the angel refused, and call that the first sin ever committed, it would not determine its origin or cause. A cause, or origin, must exist, before an effect, or production. So, after all our journeying to Heaven after a sinning angel, and after pursuing him to hell, and from hell to the earth, we have not yet answered the question, viz. What is the origin of sin? We have only shown, that the way in which this question has been generally solved, is without foundation.

Having stated what I have been told was the origin of sin, and given my reasons why I do not believe it, I now come to give my own ideas of the matter.

Scripture, with the assistance of that reason, without which, the scriptures would be of no more service to us than they are to the brute creation, I shall take for my guide, on the question before me. Almighty God is a being of infinite perfections; this the scriptures will support, and reason declare: He was the author of our existence, being the creator of the first man and woman, the occasion of their being formed of the dust of the ground, and the director of that providence by which we are all introduced by ordinary generation.

Our Maker must have had a design in the works of his hands; this the scriptures argue, and reason says. The whole of God's design must be carried into effect, and nothing more, admitting him to be an infinite being. We are informed, that God created man in his own image; that he blessed him, and set him over the works of his hands; and reason cannot deny the truth of it. But what was this image of God, in which man was created? Answer, it was Christ, who, in scripture, is called "the beginning of the creation of God;" who, St. Paul says, is the brightness of the Father's glory, and express image of his person. Now there is no need of saying much, where the truth is easy to come at. If Christ be the image of God, and man was created in God's image, it is plain, that man was created in Christ, was blessed in Christ, and in Christ set over the works of God's hands. After God had finished his work of creation, consecrated the seventh day, and rested from his labor, we are informed that there was not a man to till the ground. This information is reasonable, and authorises me to say, that as man stood in his *created* character, which is Christ, the heavenly man, he was not, at that time, formed of the dust of the ground, was not of the earth earthly, and therefore was not a tiller of the ground. We are then informed, by the sacred text, that God *formed* (not created) man of the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, whereby man became a living soul, or creature. Man is now a partaker of flesh and blood; is, as the apostle says, "*made subject* to *vanity*, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope." He has now, not an immortal, but a mortal constitution; is possessed of natural appetites and passions; and being unacquainted with the ways of his own

imperfect self, knew neither the good or evil of a mortal state. If it be said, that man was not mortal, before he sinned, and that he became mortal by sin, it is a saying as distant from good reason as imagination can go. For if man were not *mortal* before transgression, he must have been *immortal ;* if he were *immortal*, he was not subject to change, but remains still in the same *immortal* state ; and all our notions about the mortality of man is nothing but a groundless chimera. But every day's experience contradicts such absurdities.

Man, according to these statements, is of heavenly extraction ; is, in his nature, allied to the heavenly state, in which he was created, before he was formed of the dust of the ground. And I call on the reason of my reader to testify to the rationality of the idea. If the mind, spirit, soul, or whatever the reader pleases to call the immortal part of man, originated from the earthly nature of the formed creature, what is the reason that the good, which supports the formed nature, does not satisfy the soul ? Our natural appetites originate in the elements of which our bodies are composed, and aliment produced from them is sufficient to satisfy any natural appetite of the body ; but can it give a cup of consolation to the heavenly stranger within ? No ; her food is of a different kind. Was the earth, with all her mines and fruits, my own, this moment, on condition that I should give up the riches which I see in this heavenly relation, my bargain would make me poor.

As man stood in his formed state, cloathed with mortal flesh and blood, before his mind became obsequious to the elementary passions, a law was shadowed to his mind from the heavenly and spiritual man. The full spirit, power and beauty of the law,

were not perfectly understood, only a shadow of the heavenly nature passed on his mind, and the nature of that spirit being eternal, and immortally pure, was opposed to the passions which would immediately rise from the fleshly nature, and said in the understanding of the creature already made subject to vanity, *yield not to the passions and powers of the flesh, for they are death.* But immediately the powerful vibrations of the fleshly nature absorbed his mind, he sought to the carnal man for food, ate and died. These things are figuratively represented, in the scriptures. There man is represented as being placed in a garden of delights, to keep it and to dress it. The tree of life was in it, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil ; he was bid welcome to the tree of life, but was forbidden the other. A subtle serpent comes to the woman, and tempts her with the forbidden fruit ; she eats, and gives it to her husband, and he also partakes : Their eyes are opened to the knowledge of good and evil ; they see that they are naked, and hide themselves from God ; sew fig-leaves together for garments to hide their nakedness. God comes into the garden, in the cool of the day, calls for the man, and asks him if he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. He answers, that the woman whom God gave him, gave unto him and he ate. The woman is next interrogated, and she lays it to the serpent's guile. The ground is cursed, for Adam's sake ; when he tills it, it is to produce briars and thorns ; he is to eat his bread, by the sweat of his face, and at last return to the dust. The woman's conception was to be multiplied in sorrow, and her desire was to be to her husband, and he was to rule over her. The serpent was cursed above all cattle, was to go on his belly, and to eat dust as long as he lived. This is, in short,

the scripture representation of the first sin; and I consider it to be figurative.

That the Almighty ever planted a literal garden on earth, without using man as an instrument by which he did it, I have not evidence enough to believe. The garden, undoubtedly meant the moral state in which man was placed, which like a garden would become foul, if it were not dressed and kept. The tree of life, was then, what it is now, the law of the spirit of *life* in Christ Jesus; and the *little* of that spirit which was then manifested, was all the *moral* life which man possessed at that time; and, therefore, all which he was able to sin against. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was what it is now, the fleshly nature, which I have before described. The opposition of the law of the heavenly man, to that of the fleshly, is meant by the prohibition. The serpent signifies the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of the heavenly man, neither indeed can be. The carnal mind getting the victory over the *law* of *life*, in the understanding of the creature, is meant by the woman's being deceived. Adam is here the figure of him who was to come; and his partaking with the woman, shows that Christ would bear the infirmities of human nature, his bride, who, in respect to individuality, should be multiplied in sorrow, but should finally turn her desire towards her Redeemer, and he should protect her. The serpent, the cursed, is the carnal mind. His going on his belly, signifies his always being moved by fleshly lusts; and his feeding on dust, teaches that carnal mindedness never feeds on heavenly things, but on things of an earthly nature. And we may justly observe, that after all the cultivation which is bestow-

ed on the carnal or fleshly nature, it produces nothing better than briars and thorns.

Should it be said, that this garden was a literal garden, that the tree of life was a literal tree, and that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was also literal; I should be glad to be informed, what evidence can be educed in support of such an idea. Where is the garden now? Where is the tree of life now? Where is the tree of knowledge of good and evil now? Are those trees now growing on the earth as literal trees? We are not informed, in the scripture, that this garden was carried off to heaven, or that either of those trees was removed. It is written, that God drove the man whom he had made out of the garden, and placed cherubims and a flaming sword at the east of the garden, to prevent the man from approaching the tree of life. If the garden were literal, why could not Adam have gone into it on the north, south, or west side? But the *east* is the *birth-place* of *light*, and the cherubims and the flaming sword represent the law with its executive authority, which produces guilt or condemnation in the mind, and which is the death Adam died on the very day of transgression.

The path-way of understanding is now open and clear. *God* saw fit, in his plan of divine wisdom, to make the creature subject to vanity; to give him a mortal constitution; to fix in his nature those faculties which would, in their operation, oppose the spirit of the heavenly nature. It is, therefore, said, that *God put enmity* between the seed of the woman, and that of the serpent. And it was by the passions which arose from the fleshly nature, that the whole mind became carnal, and man was captivated thereby. But perhaps the objector will say, this denies the *liberty* of the *will*, and makes *God* the *author* of

sin. To which I reply, desiring the reader to recollect what I have said of sin in showing its nature; by which it is discovered, that God may be the innocent and holy cause of that, which, in a limited sense, is sin; but as it respects the meaning of God, it is intended for good. It is not casting any disagreeable reflections on the Almighty, to say he determined all things for good; and to believe he supercedes all the affairs of the universe, not excepting sin, is a million times more to the honor of God than to believe he *cannot*, or that he does not when he can. The reader will then ask, if God must be considered as the first, the holy, and the innocent cause of sin, is there any unholy or impure causes? I answer, there is, but in a limited sense. There is no divine holiness in any fleshly or carnal exercise; there is no holiness nor purity in all the deceptions ever experienced by imperfect beings; and these are the immediate causes of sin; and as such, they make the best of men on earth groan, and cry out, "Who shall deliver me from the *body* of this *death*?"

If it should be granted, that sin will finally terminate for good, in the moral system, it will then be necessary to admit that God is its first cause, or we cannot say that God is the author of all good. If we say, that sin is not for the good of God's system, but is a damage, we must also say that God would have prevented its taking place, if it had been in his power; if it were not in his power, he is not Almighty; neither can we say he is Supreme in an unlimited sense, as he was not superior to the causes which produced sin. But, to say, that God is the author of sin, says the reader, sounds very badly, let you put what coloring you please upon it; and if I believed it, I should not dare to say it. Well,

what shall I say, in order to please? Say the Devil was the author of sin. But did the Devil make himself? No; God made him an holy angel, and he made himself a devil, by transgression. Well, God made an angel, and that angel made a devil of himself, or any thing else, proves that God was the first cause as *directly* as any thing which I have argued. The objector will further say, that that angel was made a moral agent, and therefore ought to be considered the author of his own sin. But I say, in reply, that if God produced an agency, and that agency produced sin, it argues that God is the first cause, and agency the second and effective cause. If this mode of reasoning be faulted, I ask, is not God the origin and cause of all moral righteousness? None can be perverse enough to say no; then I ask, again, If moral agency, created by God, be not the *original* cause of moral *righteousness*, by what rule of reasoning, can it be made the *original* cause of *transgression*? But I have before refuted the notion about this sinning angel. I now call the attention of the reader to man, which is our proper study; and attend to the objection as it respects the liberty of the will. But, in the first place, for the sake of the argument, I will consent to any liberty of the will which is contended for; and then ask, what was the cause of man's having liberty of will? My opponent must allow it was God. Well, if God produced a *liberty* of *will* in man, and that liberty of will produced sin, is there any great difficulty in seeing, that that is making God the original cause of sin, in every sense in which I have argued it? What would the objector wish to be understood to mean, by will? If it be any thing more or less than choice, I am at a loss about it. If it be choice, then what we have to look into, is the *liberty* of

choice. In order for choice to take place, the mind must have perceptions of two, or more objects; and that object which has the most influence on the judgment and passions, will be the chosen object; and *choice*, in this instance, has not even the *shadow* of *liberty*. None will be vain enough to say, that will, or choice, has any liberty before it exists, and choice does not exist until an object is chosen; and to say, choice has liberty to refuse an object after it is chosen, is using violence on terms. And the same will be the conclusion if we take the word *will*. A person is invited, by two friends, to make them a visit the same afternoon, at their respective houses; he wishes to visit both, but cannot at the same time. In this circumstance, honored with both their invitations, he feels at a real loss what answer to make; both insist on his compliance, with equal earnestness, and with equal influence on his judgment and passions, he still remains without a determination. To end the affair, one of his friends says, I will go with you, this afternoon, and visit our friend, if you and he will return the visit next week. This decides in the mind of him who was first invited, as the other consents to the proposal. Now, *choice*, or *will*, is in favor of visiting, according to the last proposal made. Until the man willed to go, the will to go did not exist; it could have no liberty before it did exist; and after it did, to say, that that will which was to go one way, was at liberty to go the other, is using the violence before mentioned. It is then evident, that will, or choice, has no possible liberty. The objector will now move his position, and say, it is the mind that has this *liberty* to choose, or not choose; to will, or not will. In order to determine this matter justly, I first ask, does the power of choos-

ing exist in the mind, or in the object chosen? If it be answered, that the power of choice is in the mind, and not in the object which influences the mind, the man who was at a loss to determine which of his friends to visit, while the objects were in equal force on his mind, was entirely ignorant of it; and admitting it was so, it might as well have been otherwise, for the power of chusing in his mind, did him no good; he was after all, dependant on a certain circumstance, which, being attached to one object, made it preferable to the other.—Again, admitting the power of choice to be attributed to the mind, and not to the object which gives preceptions to the mind and influences it, it must be as easy for the mind to chuse a *minor*, as a *major* object. It will be granted, on all sides, that persons may chuse an object in preference to another, which is not half so valuable; but this is always in consequence of error in judgment. Now it is as objects appear to the mind, that we ought to consider them in our present query. Supposing a poor man, who has a wife and some hungry children to feed, is offered a dollar or a guinea, for a day's work; he does not know the value of either, not being acquainted with money, or its value, or the nature of the metals which are stamped with value. He consults, or means to consult the good of those for whom he is willing to labor, and would if possible, receive that which would do the most towards removing their wants; and says to himself, the dollar is much the largest, and the probability is, it is worth three times as much as the guinea; it is finally his opinion that that is the case. Now I ask in relation to my argument, which of those pieces of money will he be most likely to chuse? The answer is, the dollar. But I ask, why? If his mind

be at *real liberty*, it is no more attached to the dollar than to the guinea; the influence which the dollar has on his mind more than the guinea, destroys not the *liberty* of the mind to choose the guinea; I wish to be told, why he is more likely to choose the dollar than the guinea. Or, to alter the statement, so that the mind is not deceived. The man perfectly knows the value of both guinea and dollar. The good of his wanting family is what he means to consult; which will he be most likely to choose, in this case? answer, the guinea. I ask, again, why? Is there any reason, or is there not? There is, and it is the greater value. Then the object governs the choice. I ask, in the above instance, had the mind any *power* or *liberty* to choose the object which appeared of the least value, and refuse that which appeared of the greatest? I am sure there is not a person in the world who would say that it had. Again, admitting, for the sake of the argument that the mind possesses this imaginary liberty; I then ask, how came it to possess such liberty? Answer, *God* gave it. Then the matter stands thus, *God* produced a mind, and gave it liberty to will, or choose, and it wills or chooses; I ask, what is the original cause of this willing and choosing? The reader will easily see, that if I grant my opponent's arguments, it will not be to his advantage. Again, for the last time, if God gave to man a *liberty* whereby he can choose or refuse the same object, did he not give his creature a liberty which he did not possess himself? Did not the Infinitely Wise eternally know all that he himself would do? It must be granted. Then I ask, again, does he possess any liberty in his nature, whereby it is in his power to abandon the general system contained in his divine omnisciency, and embrace one entirely different? I am sure there are but few in the world who would not

say, as did the apostle, "He cannot deny himself." If the creature possess any ability which is not in his Creator, I would ask, first, where he got it? And, secondly, if the Almighty knew all the consequences which would arise from such an ability? If the answer be in the negative, it argues that his wisdom is finite and limited, and that he does not know but this *unaccountable* ability of willing and choosing may finally destroy his whole plan in creation, providence and redemption! If it be granted, that he did know all the consequences that would arise from this ability of willing and choosing, which is called liberty of will, it is denying its existence. For if those consequences were all *known*, it argues they were all *certain*, and none of them avoidable.

Having, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, answered the objections in respect to the liberty of the will, I would again invite him back to our subject.

The immediate causes of sin are found in our natural constitutions, and the most *distant* of those *immediate* causes are the same as the most *distant* of the *immediate* causes of our *virtues;* but the most immediate causes of our virtues and our vices are extremely different. For instance, two men meet at an inn; both of them have families which are in want of bread; they have each fifty cents, which they have just taken for their day's work. One says, to the other, come, sit down, and we will take some drink, for our comfort, after a hard day's labor. The other reflects in his mind, and says to himself, to let my children suffer, at home, to gratify my company in what is indifferent to me, would be abominable, having no particular appetite for spirits; he, therefore, refuses, bids his company good night, goes and purchases necessary provisions

for his family, and goes home. He has done as a virtuous honest husband ought to do. The other possesses a violent appetite for ardent spirits; the moment he comes where it is, his want of it overpowers his love and duty to his family, the latter object being at a distance, and the former being nigh; he calls for drink until he spends his fifty cents, and then goes home to his expecting family intoxicated. In this, according to the scriptures, though he were a professed christian, he is worse than an infidel.

In the mirror presented, the reader may see, that those two men acted equally alike from their natural wants, appetites and passions. Had neither of them any wants, appetites or passions, neither of them would have done any thing at all. They would not have labored for the money; and if they had the money, they would not have laid it out in *any* way possible. Therefore, we see, that want, appetite and passion, in one, produced *virtue*, and in the other, *vice*. But, the still more immediate causes were not the same in both persons; and the consequences to them, in a moral sense, differ as much, as did the most immediate circumstances which produced their conduct. One felt the approbation of a good conscience in having done what cool dispassionate reason dictated; the other, as soon as his eyes are opened to see what he has done, is struck with condemnation, for having violated the dictates of that law of prudence and equity, of which he was susceptible.

A beggar influenced by hunger, calls at the door of the affluent for food, he knows it is there, his appetite is good, the *object magnifies* to his *senses*; but by one who knows the *love* of *property* more than the *want* of *food*, he is sternly denied. The beggar

prostrates himself, and moves his *suit* in *language* of *distress*, reducing his *petition to only a piece of bread;* the covetous man is a little moved, with some small feelings of *compassion*, but fearing that if he should bestow, he should consequently be troubled again, bids the beggar depart, and leaves him. The beggar's object was food, and his passion hunger; he acted up to the influence of his object, and did all in his power to obtain it. The other's object was the saving of his property, and his passion was covetousness; he acted up to the influence of his object, to the gratification of his passion. Now, had the circumstance been varied so much as this, that he did not think his giving, at that time, would ever induce him to call again, the probability is, his object and his passion would both have been different; to feed an hungry man, would have been his object, and charity his passion.

Man's *main* object, in all he does, is *happiness;* and were it not for that, he never could have any other *particular* object. What would induce men to form societies; to be at the expense of supporting government; to acquire knowledge; to learn the sciences, or till the earth, if they believed they could be as happy without, as with? The fact is, man would not be the being that he now is, as there would not be any stimulus to action; he must become *inert*, therefore cease to be. As men are never without this grand object, so they are never without their wants, which render such an object desirable. But their minor objects vary, according as their understandings vary, and their passions differ. Then, says the objector, there is no such thing as *disinterested benevolence.* I answer, words are used to communicate ideas; there is that, often, in our experience, which is meant by *disinterested*

benevolence. An American is travelling in Europe; he meets, in the street, a young and beautiful *fair, bathed in tears,* her *breast swoln with grief,* and her *countenance perfectly sad.* His heart, fraught with the *keenest sensibility* is moved compassionately to inquire the cause of her *grief;* he is informed that her father, in a late sickness, became indebted to his physician twenty guineas, for which he was that hour committed to gaol, when he had but partially recovered his health. Our traveller no sooner hears the story, than he advances the twenty guineas to discharge the debt, and gives her fifty more as a reward for her generous concern. As our traveller did not expect any *pecuniary reward,* either *directly* or *indirectly,* his *charity* is called *disinterested benevolence.* But, strictly speaking, he was greatly *interested;* he was *interested* in the afflictions of father and child; their relief was his object, and charity his passion. Now did he not act for his own happiness? Yes, as much as ever a man did in life. What must have been his misery, possessing the same disposition, without the means to relieve? And what a sublime satisfaction he enjoyed, by the bestowment of his favor! Sacred truth informs us, "It is more blessed to give, than to receive."

We find some men honest and industrious; who think, and think justly, that happiness is not to be found in any other way. Others are indolent and knavish, and they expect to obtain happiness in so being. But they are deceived in their objects; and will finally learn, that they must be, what conscience has often told them they ought to be, honest and just, in order to be happy.

The objector will say, to admit that our happiness, is the grand object of all we do, destroys the purity of religion, and reduces the whole to noth-

ing but selfishness. To which, I reply, a man acting for his own happiness, if he seek it in the heavenly system of *universal benevolence*, knowing that his own happiness is connected with the happiness of his fellow men, which induces him to do justly, and to deal mercifully with all men, he is no more *selfish* than he ought to be. But a man acting for his own happiness, if he seek it in the *narrow circle* of *partiality* and *covetousness*, his *selfishness* is *irreligious* and *wicked*.

I know it is frequently contended, that we ought to love God for what he is, and not for what we receive from him; that we ought to love holiness for holiness' sake, and not for any advantage such a principle is to us. This is what I have often been told, but what I never could see any reason for, or propriety in. I am asked, if I love an orange; I answer I never tasted of one; but am told, I must love the orange for what it is! Now I ask, is it possible for me either to like or dislike the orange, in reality, until I taste it? Well, I taste of it, and like it. Do you like it? says my friend. Yes, I reply, its flavor is exquisitely agreeable. But that will not do, says my friend; you must not like it because its taste is agreeable, but you must like it because it is an orange. If there be any propriety in what my friend says, it is out of my sight. A man is travelling on the sands of Arabia, he finds no water for a number of days; the sun scorches, and he is exceedingly dry; at last, he finds water and drinks to his satisfaction; never did water taste half so agreeably before. To say, that this man loves the water because it is water, and not because of the advantage which he receives from it, betrays a large share of inconsistency. Would not this thirsty traveller have loved the burning sand as well

So a man who is thirsty the sight of an Orange x what

as he did the water, if it had tasted as agreeably, and quenched his thirst as well? The sweet Psalmist of Israel said, "*O taste* and see that the *Lord is good.*" And an apostle says, "We love him *because he first loved us.*" What attribute do we ascribe to God, that we do not esteem on account of its advantage to us? Justice would have been no more likely to be attributed to the Almighty than injustice, if it had not first been discovered that justice was of greater advantage to mankind than injustice. And so of power, were it of no more advantage to human society than weakness; the latter would have been as likely to have been esteemed an attribute of God, as the former. If wisdom were of no greater service to man than folly, it would not have been adored in the Almighty, any more than folly. If love were no more happyfying to man than hatred, hatred would as soon have been esteemed an attribute of God, as love.

Undoubtedly the Almighty loves without an influential object, as it would be erroneous to suppose that an infinite being could be operated upon. He loves, because his nature is to love. An apostle says, "God is love." The sun does not shine, because our earth influences it; it is the nature of the sun to shine. But all created beings love, because of influential objects; and they always love according to the influence which objects have on their minds and passions. It seems then, says the objector, that our vices are not to be attributed to the devil, but to the influence which objects have on our minds. Surely the reader ought to expect, that after I have denied the existence of a being, I should, likewise deny his power. Perhaps, however, the reader may be surprised, to find that I do not believe in the existence of a being so univer-

sally acknowledged among christian people, and which perhaps, has been of as much advantage to some, as the *Goddess Dianna* was to the *craftsmen of Ephesus.* But I am willing to give my reasons for not believing with the multitude, in this particular. A created individual being cannot be in more than one place, at the same time. But how many *millions* of places must this evil angel be in, at once, in order to perform the business which christians have allotted him? In order for me to believe in such a being, I must give him the omnipresency of the Almighty, which belongs to none, in my opinion, but my Maker. Again, to admit the existence of such a being, would be of no avail, as there is nothing for him to do. There is, says the objector; he tempts men to sin. But, does he tempt men contrary to their passions and the influence of their motives? Answer, no. Then the temptation is of no possible consequence. Supposing a man to be exceedingly hungry, and an agreeable meal is set before him, and he invited to refresh; at that moment, the devil comes and tempts him to eat.—What effect would the temptation have on the hungry man? Or supposing, in room of tempting him to eat, he should tempt him not to eat, would he be likely to succeed? But what means the scripture, which speaks of a devil? one who was a liar from the beginning, &c. I answer, I have no objection to believing, that there is *such* a *devil* as the *scripture speaks of.* He is called the old Serpent, and is the same I have described, which beguiled the woman, in the beginning; and it is the carnal mind which is enmity against God. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman," saith the Lord, "between her seed and thy seed." An apostle says, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit,

against the flesh, that ye cannot do the things ye would." And, that this was the first beguiler, we may learn, from the scripture, which saith, "*Lust*, when it conceived, brought forth sin; and, sin when it was finished, brought forth death." An apostle also says, "When a man is *tempted*, he is *drawn away* with his own lusts, and enticed. Any person, who is wholly dictated by a fleshly mind, may justly be called a devil, as in the case of Judas and Peter.—As our Lord said to the Jews, also, "Ye are of your father, the devil; and the lusts of your father, ye will do." But, says the objector, do you think our Saviour was tempted by the powers of the flesh, when it was said, he was tempted by the devil? I ask, in my turn, for what is this particular circumstance introduced? If we cannot prove, from our own experience, that we are tempted by some other being than our own fleshly appetites, would it be any thing more than a speculative belief, to admit another tempter? But, says the objector, that does not answer the question. Then, let us look at his temptations; when he hungered, he was tempted; by what? and to what? Answer, by hunger, to turn stones into bread. Here was a fleshly appetite. When he had a view of all the kingdoms of the earth, and their worldly glory, he was tempted to avail himself of them. Here was natural ambition, such as gave rise to the victories of an Alexander. When on the pinnacle of the temple, he was tempted to cast himself down, as it was written concerning him, that God would give his angels charge over him, &c. Here was that passion which gives rise to presumption, and wishes to avoid duty. But it is said, the *devil taketh him about*, thus and so; not literally, however, for there is no *mountain* in the *world* that commands a *prospect* of but a *small part*

of the *kingdoms* of the *world.* The *exceeding high mountain* on which our Redeemer ſtood, when he ſaw all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, was the mountain of *human pride.* Remember, when a perſon is *on* a mountain, the mountain is *beneath his feet.* So was this mountain of *human pride beneath the feet* of our ſinleſs Redeemer; but, at the ſame time, it gave him a proſpect of all which the world calls great and glorious. In a word, the ſcriptures inform us, that he was tempted in all points as we are, yet without ſin. If, therefore, we know how we are tempted, we know, alſo, how he was tempted. It is a ſentiment of mine, that we ought not to argue that for truth, in matters of this nature, which we have no knowledge of, by experience.

Having illuſtrated the original cauſe, and the ſecondary cauſes of ſin, I paſs to take notice of its conſequences.

In order to have our work plain before us, I obſerve, ſin is the fruits of the fleſh, which are oppoſed to that true light, which lighteth every man who cometh into the world. And St. Paul ſays, they are manifeſt. See Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. "Now the works of the fleſh are manifeſt, which are theſe, adultery, fornication, uncleanneſs, laſciviouſneſs, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, ſtrife, ſeditions, hereſies, envying, murders, drunkenneſs, revellings, and ſuch like." Theſe are the ſins which our fleſhly minds are daily producing, and their conſequences are witneſſed by a miſerable world. By theſe ſins, with their aſſociates, mankind are rendered miſerable indeed. Social and domeſtic happineſs is frequently deſtroyed. *Cold* and *cruel jealouſy* murders the ſoft and tender paſſions of love, as Cain ſlew his bro-

ther. A garden, enclofed by the walls of fidelity, decked with the flowers of innocence, watered with the living ftreams of love, teeming with fruits of richeft repaft, and adorned with the vine of future profpects, is laid wafte in an hour. Jealoufy, like a foe bent on plunder, flung down the wall, dried up the ftream, and, like a devouring worm, gnawed the vine, that it perifhed; the flowers droop, and the fruits wither away. Nothing remains but fome faint veftiges of what is ruined, ferving as evidence of the melancholly truth, that fin has found its way to this once happy place.

Idolatry is the fin of worfhipping that, which is not, in reality, the true God. The Old Serpent could never long hold the creature in captivity, if he did not allow him a god to worfhip, and religious duties to amufe him. I have already argued that man is of heavenly extraction, that he is related to his Maker, is a dependant being; and, therefore, to worfhip, is perfectly natural to him. Then, in order for the carnal mind to take the lead of the whole man, it muft introduce a god to be worfhipped, and religious duties, whereby this god may be pleafed, and make the creature believe, that this god is the true God, and that thofe religious duties are of the genuine kind. But this god will furely poffefs all the vile paffions of the old man, Adam, and thofe religious duties muft confift in certain rites, which bear no relation to *heaven-born charity*, or *deeds of kindnefs*. An Almighty, omniprefent, infinitely wife and good, may be talked of; but his wifdom, power and goodnefs, muft be denied; and he muft be a great many millions of miles off, fixed to a certain place, yet every where prefent; infinitely wife and powerful, yet fuffers an everlafting violation of his

will ; poſſeſſed of infinite wiſdom, yet, is diſappointed in his plans ; loves ſome of his creatures, and hates others ; is pleaſed and diſpleaſed with the conduct of his creatures ; is perfectly unchangeable, yet loves, at one time, and, at another, hates the ſame object. Such an idol will anſwer for thouſands. Now what are the conſequences ? Anſwer, one nation ſuppoſes itſelf the only favorite of God ; other people are haters of him, and hated by him. If my God hates thoſe who hate him, I ought to do as my God does, and I will hate them too. One denomination of chriſtians has different ideas of the attributes of their God from another ; they are violently oppoſed to each other ; they are at *ſwords' points ;* they call each other heretics, and doom each other to the *endleſs wrath* of their *God !* All ſuch religion is of the fleſh ; the wiſdom of it is not from above, but is earthly, ſenſual and deviliſh, and thoſe who poſſeſs it are *tormented day* and *night* with it. Reader, turn over the pages of hiſtory, calculate the rivers of blood which have been ſhed on account of religious diſputes, and aſk yourſelf the queſtion, is this religion worthy of a Supreme Being ? The devil will have religion, and will have it maintained as long as he can ; but then, he muſt tell the people, that it is none of his, but that it came from the true and living God, or they will not believe it. It is an object with the Old Serpent, to have a great many denominations, and to perſuade them that they are *individually right*, and *individually wrong*, and to ſtir up their minds to maintain their reſpective tenets, and to wage war with each other, which he calls *contending earneſtly for the faith.* Many who profeſs to be called by Him who loved ſinners, to preach his goſpel, and who pretend to fol-

low the Saviour, in the path of meekneſs, if they happen to think a little different, in matters of faith, they are filled with the greateſt vehemency towards each other, which they call holy wrath, or indignation; and you might as well reaſon with hungry lions, or tigers, as with them, for they worſhip the *beaſt* and they partake largely of his nature. Did they worſhip the true God, in the ſpirit of the heavenly man, difference, in particular ſentiments, would not hinder their fellowſhip, and love one to another. All the religion in our world, founded on the *partial principles of man's inventions*, pointing out particular modes of faith, and forms of worſhip, is from the carnal man. Diſcord and contention enſue; wars and fightings are the conſequences; hatred, wrath, ſtrife, emulation, and rivalſhip, rage in the minds of thoſe who poſſeſs this ſpurious religion. What I ſay, is a truth of univerſal notoriety; and yet, what is very ſtrange, is, people are not convinced of it. As if a *monſtrous wolf* ſhould *ravage*, in *open day light*, in the high and low parts of the ſhepherd's paſture, gorging his carnivorous appetite with the blood and fat of the flock; and the ſhepherd thinks it is all well, becauſe ſomebody, on whoſe ſleeve he pins his faith, has told him that, that creature is a ſheep, and that it will do no harm! How miſerable has religion made mankind! But, ſays the reader, it was ſin that you were to tell the conſequences of, not religion. I tell you, kind reader, that the religion of which I ſpeak, is oppoſed to every decree of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, which has ever been revealed to mankind, and, therefore, is ſin; and that which is attended with the moſt pernicious conſequences. It is this kind of religion which takes away the "key of knowledge;" its

votaries neither enter the kingdom of heaven themſelves, nor ſuffer thoſe to enter who would. All worſhip, which is dictated by modes and forms, as inventions of men, is oppoſed to the true worſhip. "The Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him, who worſhip him in *ſpirit* and in *truth*." Nothing ſuits the *carnal mind better than religion*; but it muſt be a child of her own, and muſt look juſt like herſelf. The carnal mind being the hot bed where all the roots of bitterneſs grow which trouble mankind, we ought to look there, for the foundation of all that religion which bears the features of the ſerpent. *Pride* is the moſt *prominent characteriſtic* of a fleſhly mind, its religion dictates to look with contempt on thoſe who are not of the ſame mode of faith, who do not ſubſcribe to the ſame articles of belief, and are not called by the ſame denomination; and ſays, "Stand by thyſelf, come not nigh me, for I am holier than thou." It dictates to give thanks for not being like others; it boaſts of performances wrought with great pains and expenſe; it boaſts of having "borne the burden and heat of the day," and dictates to expect more than others receive: "But the carnal mind," ſays the reader, "makes no uſe of the ſcriptures, does it?" Always, beſure, where it is faſhionable to believe them, and men are *deſpiſed*, if they do not. Any thing will do, of which the creature is proud, and is willing to *perſecute* others for not adopting. But ought not men to be deſpiſed, and called all to naught, who do not believe the bible to be the word of God? The Old Serpent will anſwer, yes, where it ſuits his turn beſt; but the ſpirit of Chriſt anſwers, no, in *all caſes*. If the ſcriptures *be not the word of God*, men ought not to be *deſpiſed* for not believing them; and if they be,

they ought not to be *despised*, but *pitied* and *enlightened*. Remember, our acceptable *High Priest* was one who could "have compassion on the ignorant, and on them who are out of the way." Emulation, or rivalship, is one of the works of the flesh, and it is enmity against the meek and humble spirit of Christ; and its consequences are pernicious beyond description. In matters called religion, we see much of this iniquity, as well as in natural things. One denomination wishes to rival another; one preacher wishes to rival another; and how often is it the case, that professed christians will act more underhandedly, to obtain an advantage over a professor of a different denomination, than a common *jockey* is willing to do, in order to obtain a bargain. And I will say more, I have often seen, in the same churches, persons at such variance, about matters of their religion, that truth seemed not to be regarded, in the least, on either side; each would strive to *crush his brother*, until two parties were formed, and a whole town set in an uproar. This is the religion which pleases the carnal mind, but it is death. One nation looks with an envious eye on the increasing wealth and population of another. She forms a *subterfuge*, as a *pretext* for *declaring war* against her neighbor, by which the two nations are drawn into a contention; a long war ensues, bringing horrors, to describe which, would swell a volume to an enormous size. Look on France and England, this moment, and for many years back. Who could calculate one half the miseries produced from the spirit of rivalship between these potent rivals. How many brave youth have fallen a sacrifice to ambition; how oft has the ground drunk copious draughts of human blood; the *bosom* of the *deep*

been *reddened* with the *gore* of the *ſlain ;* and Sharks and Sea Dogs fed on the ſons of mourning fathers and weeping mothers ; while the leaders of this calamity make high profeſſions of the religion of the meek and lowly Jeſus, and are frequently ſending out their proclamations for faſts, and for prayers to Almighty God, to aſſiſt them in human butchery ! " From whence come wars and ſightings among you ? come they not even from your luſts, which war againſt the ſoul ?" It is recorded in the ſcriptures, that the *love* of money is the root of all evil. But men would have no love for money, were it not for the earthly advantages obtained by it. Then, the paſſion is covetouſneſs, and the conſequence is miſchievous to mankind. One, for the ſake of money, will ſteal, another will lie, another counterfeit the currency, and another will murder. Were it not for the ſake of property, would men do theſe things ? Anſwer, no. Then, in relation to what I have before argued, I aſk, would men be induſtrious, were it not for the ſake of property ? Anſwer, no ; then the caſe is plain, that they both act from the ſame *main paſſion*, which is want, and to the ſame *main object*, which is happineſs. But their minor objects and their minor paſſions vary. What need would there be of government, were it not for ſin ? If all were willing to do, as they would be done by, what an enormous expenſe would be ſaved ; as it would render governmental laws uſeleſs. But by reaſon of men's paſſions, and miſtaken objects influencing them, our lives are expoſed to be taken by our neighbors, our property pillaged, our hard earnings wrung by violence away, and our midnight ſlumbers interrupted by banditti, and, in ſhort, all that is dear to us, to be taken from our

enjoyment. "He, who loveth not his brother, is a murderer." Are not all men murderers? do they not ſometimes experience the lack of brotherly love? This murderous paſſion is ſin, it is oppoſed to the language of the heavenly man in the mind; but what are its conſequences? Every one endeavors to ſupplant his brother; no one is ſafe, in his feelings, while he is in the hands of his brother. When this paſſion reigns, all the tender charities of humanity are ſuppreſſed; all the *bowels* of *compaſſion* are *frozen;* a deaf ear is turned to the *cries* and *calls* of the *needy* in *diſtreſs;* the poor are deſpiſed by the rich, the rich are envied by the poor; parents are diſhonored by their children; children are abuſed, and provoked to anger by their parents. The vile affections of ſin will burn to the deſtruction of the ſweeteſt harmonies of nature; the *whiteſt robes of innocence* are *ſtained* with its *indelible crimſon;* the ſoul is drowned in the *black waters* of *iniquity*, and the whole mind, with every faculty, is *plunged* into the *hell* of moral *death.*

Yet, liſten to the worſt of torments, in conſequence of ſin. "A wounded conſcience, who can bear?" A *fire* that burns all the day long, a ſword that continually pierceth the ſoul, a ſting that cannot exhauſt its poiſon, a fever that never turns till the patient dies. "*A dart ſtruck through his liver.*" What ails the ſinner? why his hand on his breaſt? There gnaws the worm that never dies, there burns the fire that is never quenched. A conſciouſneſs of guilt deſtroys all the *expected* comforts, and pleaſures of ſin. How ſtrange it is, that after a thouſand diſappointments in ſucceſſion, men are not diſcouraged. O ſin! how you paint your face; how you flatter us, poor mortals, on to death; you never appear to the ſinner in your true

character; you make us fair promiſes, but you never fulfilled one; your tongue is ſmoother than oil, but the poiſon of aſps is under your lips; you have impregnated all our paſſions with the venom of your poiſon; you have ſpread gloomy darkneſs over the whole region of the ſoul; you have endeavored, with your ſtupefactive poiſon, to blunt the ſword in the hands of the cherubims, which, for your ſake, keeps us from the tree of life.

A miſtaken idea has been entertained of ſin, even by profeſſors. I have often heard ſincere miniſters preach, in their reproofs to their hearers, that it was the greateſt folly in the world, for people to forego ſalvation, in a future ſtate, for the *comforts* and *pleaſures* of *ſin* in this. Such exhortations really defeat their intentions. The wiſh of the honeſt preacher is, that the wicked ſhould repent of their ſins, and do better; but, at the ſame time, he indicates, that ſin, at preſent, is more productive of happineſs than righteouſneſs; but that the bad will come in another world; that although *doing well* is a *hard way*, yet, its advantages will be great, in another ſtate. Juſt as much as any perſon thinks ſin to be more happyfying than righteouſneſs, he is ſinful; his heart eſteems it, though, in ſome poſſible caſes, for fear of the loſs of ſalvation in the world to come, he may abſtain from ſome outward enormities; yet, his heart is full of the deſire of doing them. A thief paſſes a merchant's ſhop, wiſhes to ſteal ſome of his goods, but durſt not, for fear of apprehenſion and puniſhment. Is this man leſs a *thief*, at *heart*, for not actually taking the goods? I have been told, by perſons of *high profeſſions* in *chriſtianity*, that if they were certain of ſalvation in the world to come, they *would commit every ſin*, to which their *unbridled paſ-*

ſions might lead them; even from the lips of ſome who *profeſs to preach the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, have I heard ſuch-like expreſſions! I do not mention theſe things to caſt reflections on any perſon, or denomination in the world; for I have a favorable hope, that there are ſome, in all denominations, who are not ſo deceived; but I mention them, in order to ſhow how deceiving ſin is, to the mind. It is as much the nature of ſin, to torment the mind, as it is the nature of fire to burn our fleſh. Sin deprives us of every rational enjoyment, ſo far as it captivates the mind; it was never able to furniſh one drop of cordial for the ſoul; her tender mercies are cruelty, and her *breaſts* of *conſolation* are *gall* and *wormwood*. Sin is a falſe mirror, by which the ſinner is deceived in every thing on which his mind contemplates. If he think of his Maker, who is his beſt friend, it ſtrikes him with awe, fills his mind with fearful apprehenſions, and he wiſhes there was no ſuch being. If he think of any duty which he owes his Maker, he ſays, in a moment, God is a hard maſter, why ſhould he require of me what is ſo contrary to my happineſs? Religion is only calculated to make men miſerable; righteouſneſs blunts my paſſions, and deprives me of pleaſures for which I long. But it repreſents ſtolen waters to be ſweet, and bread eaten in ſecret to be pleaſant. In a word, ſin is of a torment-giving nature to every faculty of the ſoul, and is the moral death of the mind.

Well, ſays the reader, can ſin have all thoſe evil effects, and not be *infinite?* Undoubtedly, as all thoſe evil effects are experienced in this finite ſtate. Thouſands, who, I hope, are gone to greater degrees of reſt, than the moſt upright enjoy here, were once tormented with ſin, were once under

the dominion of the carnal mind. The effects of ſin, as ſin, are not endleſs, but limited to the ſtate in which it is committed. This, perhaps, will be contrary to the opinion of many who read this treatiſe, as they are wont to ſuppoſe, that there are *three cardinal conſequences* produced by ſin, viz. *Death temporal*, *death ſpiritual*, and *death eternal*.

As to the firſt of theſe conſequences, I think I have plainly refuted it. Men die natural deaths, becauſe they are naturally mortal; but they are not mortal becauſe of ſin, for man was mortal before he ſinned; if he were not, he never could have ſinned. My opponent will ſay, that the death of the body is the conſequence of ſin, when one man murders another; to which I reply, one man could not murder another, if men were not mortal. Sin cannot be ſaid to be the cauſe of natural death, any more than of natural life. I will acknowledge that ſin is often the mean whereby natural life is ended, and my oppoſer muſt acknowledge, that it is often the mean of perſons being introduced into natural life. Perhaps an hundred are introduced into exiſtence by illicit connections, where one is taken out by malice prepenſe. But the meaning of the objector is, that man became mortal by ſin; to which I reply, if immortality be corruptible by ſin, the chriſtian hope of immortality is a vain one. The death which Adam died, in conſequence of ſin, happened on the day of tranſgreſſion, if we may believe the ſcripture account about it; but Adam did not die a natural death, on that day, nor for ſome hundreds of years afterwards.

The way in which many have tried to reconcile the ſcriptures with their traditions, in this matter, appears ſtrange to me; they quote 2 Peter, iii. 8.

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day with the Lord, is as a thouſand years, and a thouſand years as one day;" and as Adam died ſhort of a thouſand years, he died in the day of tranſgreſſion. But, in order for the text to read to their meaning, it ought to read thus, "One day with the Lord *is* a thouſand years, and a thouſand years *is* one day;" as they underſtand the text, the conjunction *as* has no poſſible meaning. In reſpect to *ſpiritual death*, I believe it was all that was meant by the word, "*in* the *day* thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die." But, if *eternal death* were alſo intended, there was no recovery for man. Why divines have carried this matter ſo erroneouſly beyond all ſcripture tenets, I cannot imagine. But, it is ſaid, ſpiritual or moral death would be eternal, were it not for the diſpenſation of the goſpel, by which death is ſwallowed up of life. So we might ſay of any thing elſe, even of a momentary nature; it would be eternal, if it were never to end. The days of a man's life would be *eternal*, if they were never to end. The ſpring would be *eternal*, if it were not ſucceeded with the ſummer. A roſe would be an eternal flower, if it never withered. And youth would be *eternal*, if it were not for old age and death. But what do all ſuch arguments avail? The grand, ſublime and glorious ſyſtem of God, carries every thing away that has its birth from mortality and time.

I have already hinted, that ſin might have conſequences which were not evil, but not as ſin. By the infinite wiſdom and goodneſs of the Almighty, ſin may be of advantage even to the ſinner himſelf; but I ſay again, not as ſin. If the infinitely Wiſe and Good intended any one thing for good, which we rightly call ſin, that event, in reſpect to

the divine intention, is not ſin. I have introduced a circumſtance, in the fore part of this work, in which, what I am now endeavoring to illuſtrate, may clearly be ſeen. It is evident that, that which Joſeph's brethren meant unto evil, God meant unto good. Now the immediate conſequences of their ſin, to them, was guilt of the firſt magnitude. Who could calculate the one half of what they endured, in conſequence of the wrong which they had done? But the conſequences which God intended, in the iſſue of the event, were altogether beneficial; and thoſe who committed the ſin, by the mercy of God, were made the partakers of the benefits contained in the purpoſe of him who meant it for good.

Again, it is evident from the ſcriptures, that Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, were gathered together againſt Jeſus, to do what the council and the hand of the Almighty had determined to be done. See Acts iv. 27, 28. Had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, any better meaning, in crucifying Chriſt, than Joſeph's brethren had in ſelling Joſeph to the Iſhmaelites? All who read the queſtion, will anſwer, no. But the ſacred text ſays, they were gathered together to do whatſoever *God's hand* and *council* had *determined* to be done. Now I aſk, was not the determination of the murderers of Chriſt, the ſame, with the determination of Divine Wiſdom? Says the reader, I cannot ſay it was not, and yet, I dare not ſay it was. I will then anſwer, the Almighty intended all they did, ſhould be done; but he intended it for a very different purpoſe from what they did, who did it. They intended the *deſtruction* and *overthrow* of the *doctrine* which Chriſt preached, and they hoped the things

which he had ſpoken, concerning them, would fail of taking place. But the means which they uſed to oppoſe the cauſe of Chriſt, were thoſe with which God intended to promote it. They miſſed of their intentions, and the Lord carried the whole of his into effect. What chriſtian is there in the world, who will ſay, the conſequences of the death of Chriſt are not good? or, that thoſe who were his murderers, for whom he *prayed* on the *croſs*, will not receive an advantage from his death, which they meant for evil? Or who can *limit* the good contained in the deſigns of the Almighty? But will this rule do, ſays the reader, to apply to all ſin? I anſwer, without heſitancy, that I fully believe it. Food for the body would never pleaſe the appetite, unleſs we firſt experienced hunger; the cooling ſpring would not be ſought for, if men were never thirſty; health could never be prized, could we not contraſt it with ſickneſs; eaſe is appreciated, by the remembrance of pain; and a phyſician would never be wanted, if it were not for our infirmities; a Saviour would never have been praiſed, by his redeemed, had they never been in bondage; the ſong, "*Thou haſt redeemed us to God*, out of *every kingdom* and *nation*," could never be ſung, had redemption not been needed; a fountain would never have been opened, for Judah and Jeruſalem to waſh in, from ſin and uncleanneſs, had it not been for ſin and uncleanneſs. Then, ſays my opponent, we may do evil, that good may come. This objection has often been ſtated to me, in converſation on this ſubject. My reply is ſhort. There is a ſelf-contradiction in the objection; to do any thing whatever, for good, is not a moral tranſgreſſion. Had Joſeph's brethren been taught

of God, that it was neceſſary for them to ſell Joſeph to the Iſhmaelites, that he might go down to Egypt, and there prepare for the famine, and they had done it, for the good which God intended, it would have been no more ſin, in them, than there was in the *deſign* of God. Then it is plain, that to do evil, that good may come, is impoſſible.

Again, had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Iſrael, intended the good which God intended, in the crucifixion of Chriſt, *ſin* would have been out of the queſtion. St. Paul aſks the queſtion to his oppoſers, after he had argued, that, *where ſin abounded, grace* did *much more abound*, "Shall we continue in ſin, that grace may abound?" And anſwers it thus, *God* forbid. How ſhall we, who are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? If we are truly enlightened into the nature of the all-abounding grace of the goſpel, it cauſes us to die to ſin; and if we are *dead* to *ſin*, we ſhall not *live* in it. God has forbidden it, in the nature of things, and rendered it impoſſible.

As I have limited ſin in its nature, the reader will not expect to find unlimited conſequences attached to it, in this work. Were it ſo, that the fulneſs of the divine law was perfectly comprehended in the mind of the creature, and he ſhould go contrary thereto, his ſin would then be as infinite as the law trangreſſed; but I argue, that the law tranſgreſſed, is a law formed in the mind of an imperfect being, by the imperfect knowledge which he obtains of the *divine law*, which is no other than God himſelf. This knowledge being imperfect, forms a law like itſelf, imperfect and mutable; and an imperfect, mutable law does not afford data, from which to argue endleſs conſequences. The ſacred oracle declares, "the ſoul

that ſins ſhall die:" If it had added and ſaid, "and ſhall *never live again*," it would have carried the conſequences of ſin infinitely farther than the Holy Ghoſt intended. Sin is death to the ſoul, as long as it ſins, be that time longer or ſhorter. In order to argue an endleſs conſequence, we muſt firſt ſtate an infinite cauſe; and as I have argued ſin on a finite ſcale, and in a limited circle, I muſt rationally limit its conſequences.

I will now ſtate two particulars, which the reader will find argued in the courſe of this work, ſtate my opponent's objections againſt them, anſwer thoſe objections, and introduce my ſecond general inquiry, by ſtating a third objection.

1ſt. Man is dependant, in all his volitions, and moves by neceſſity.

2d. The Almighty has a *good intention*, in every volition of man.

Objection firſt. If man move by neceſſity, why do the ſcriptures abound with exhortations and admonitions to diſſuade from ſin, and ſo many inducements to perſuade to holineſs and virtue? And why are there requirements in the law, to which man is under the neceſſity of going contrary?

Objection 2d. If God have a good intention, in every action or volition of man, why is it ſaid, in the ſcriptures, that he is grieved and provoked with us? &c.

The propoſition, againſt which the firſt objection ſtands, anſwers the objection, in all its parts. It was in the ſyſtem of divine wiſdom, that man ſhould experience a conſciouſneſs of ſin and guilt, without which, the ſubject of my inquiry could never have exiſted. If ſin and guilt had never been introduced into our ſyſtem, the plan of grace,

by atonement, could never have been exhibited. Sin and guilt could never have exiſted, providing there had been no prohibition communicated to the intelligent mind; and, on the other hand, if the mind poſſeſſed as much liberty to go contrary to inducements, as it does inclination to follow them, inducements would have no poſſible effect; exhortations, admonitions, and warnings, would be of no poſſible ſervice.

If God purpoſed that man ſhould come to the knowledge of his own infirmities in the way that he does, he muſt have intended all the means whereby the purpoſe might be accompliſhed. And if he deſigned, that any degree of moral holineſs ſhould be found on earth, ſuch inducements muſt influence the minds of men, which would neceſſarily produce it. That God does, in a ſtrict ſenſe of ſpeaking, require more of any of his creatures than they are able to perform, is inconſiſtent with the dictates of good reaſon, and deſtitute of ſcripture authority; and has no better foundation for its ſupport, than an idea that darkneſs originates in the ſun, or light in an opaque body. But does not God require perfect holineſs of man? Does he not command ſtrict obedience, to every jot and tittle of his law?

I have before argued, that the ſpirit of God's law, in its infinite fulneſs, was above the capacity of man in a finite ſtate, in which he was made ſubject to vanity; and that it was the ſhadow of the law only that was introduced to the creature's underſtanding, and that for the purpoſe, that the *offence* might abound. Then, ſays my opponent, if you are correct, in this ſtatement, does it not prove that the requirement is more than the abili-

ties of the creature can perform ? And how can the difficulty be removed ?

The ſubject now in queſtion, is a query, on which, many religious diſputes have ariſen, and much difference of ſentiments reſted. Two grand parties, in Chriſtendom, have been formed by it ; and thoſe two have ſubdivided, according to their different modes of ſolving thoſe difficulties, to which they have been driven by their antagoniſts.

Some have contended, that in the beginning, man was poſſeſſed of ſufficient ability to have kept the law of his Maker perfectly ; but, that he loſt that ability, by tranſgreſſion ; and, that neither Adam, nor his poſterity, was ever able to retrieve it ; but, although man has loſt his ability to obey, God has not loſt his right to command. This has appeared to many, to be ſound argument.

Suppoſing Government had an occaſion for raiſing an army, and ſhould command a cripple to bear arms, and endure fatigue : The poor cripple deſires conſideration, on account of his infirmities, but is told, that his father crippled him, in infancy, which, if he had not done, he would now have been able to endure fatigue ; but, as his father did him this piece of miſchief, in his infancy, he muſt, and ought to comply with impoſſibilities, on pain of death ! This has juſt the ſame appearance of *ſound reaſon* as the other.

Others have endeavored to ſolve this matter, by placing a *total inability* in the *will* of the creature ; arguing, that no ability is wanting but a willingneſs, &c. They admit, at the ſame time, that the power of altering the will, does not belong to the creature. Theſe argue, that this *inability* is *criminality*. I have already ſhown, that will is a conſequence ariſing from our perceptions of objects,

which proves, if our underſtanding were perfect, our will would be ſo. The criminality, therefore, might be placed on the underſtanding, as well as on the will. The reader will obſerve, that I am ſpeaking of criminality, which is ſuppoſed to be ſeen by the Allwiſe, in his creatures. It certainly cannot be *difficult* for the reader to ſee, that there is as much inability in the *underſtanding*, as there is in the *will*, when a man is ſo much deceived, as to think it more for his happineſs to be diſhoneſt, than to be governed by the principles of integrity.

Others ſay, Adam loſt his ability to obey, by tranſgreſſion, but that God reſtored it again, by the Mediator, and man poſſeſſes it now, as the gift of God, through Chriſt; and argue, that it is in the power of man to keep the law of God perfectly. If this be the caſe, it ſeems that it might as well have been otherwiſe, as there is not a juſt man on earth, who liveth and ſinneth not. All who argue this idea, acknowledge that they have been ſinners; and indeed, if they did not, they would have no part nor lot in the ſon of Jeſſe.

Let us now ſtate fairly, this *gordian-knot*, and ſee if we can find a *truth* that will cut it. If it ſtand in a plain contradiction in words, it will the better expoſe its difficulties, and we ſhall the better know how to attack it. I will ſtate it thus, God requires of man what he *cannot* perform; *all* that God requires of man, man *can* perform: And now for the *truth* that will *ſhine to illuminate ſo dark a place.* Obſerve, with attention; God's *holy*, *juſt* and *infinitely perfect law*, ſtands in the *eternal conſtitution* of the *heavenly man*, the *ſecond Adam*, the *Lord* from *heaven*; it requires *perfect holineſs* in *Chriſt* the *Mediator*, who is the *Lord*, our righteouſneſs. And in him, we are able to fulfil all righteouſneſs, and

ſtand unaccuſed and uncondemned. I ſay more, we have never violated that perfect law of holineſs, in the heavenly nature, but have fulfilled all it required. But we are *unable* to fulfil thoſe divine requirements in our *carnal*, or *old man*. I have already hinted, that perfect wiſdom and knowledge were neceſſary, in order to fulfil a perfect law. And it is in *Chriſt alone*, that we find all the *treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge;* in him, we poſſeſs every ability, to keep the law of God perfectly; but in the earthly Adam, we have not one ſingle faculty, that is fit for ſo holy a ſervice.

I may now venture to ſtate more contradictions. I am a fool; and yet, I am wiſe. I am weak; and yet, I am ſtrong. I am impure; and yet, I am pure. I am unholy; and yet, I am holy. I am condemned; and yet, I am juſtified. I am a veſſel of diſhonor; and yet, I am a veſſel of glory. I am dead; and yet, I live. I have loſt my life; and yet, I have gained it. I fell, in the field of battle; and yet, gained the victory. I am a periſhable worm of the duſt; and yet, an immortal ſpirit.

When the Lord gave the tables of the covenant to Moſes, on the Mount, he went down to the children of Iſrael, found them worſhipping the calf which Aaron had made, and being angry thereat, *broke* the *tables* which he had received. The Lord again called Moſes to the Mount, and gave him other tables, and gave orders for them to be depoſited in the ark of the covenant, where they were preſerved. By this, we are taught the unſafety of the law, in our hands, in the earthly nature, and its ſafety in Chriſt, the heavenly.

I come to take notice of the ſecond objection. There are many paſſages of ſcripture, which re-

preſent the Almighty as poſſeſſing irritable paſſions, like his creatures. We are told, that it repented him that he had made man on the earth, and that it *grieved* him at the *heart*. Theſe expreſſions are as ſtrong in their indications of *changeability*, as any that might be choſen. An apoſtle exhorts, not to *grieve* the *Holy Spirit;* and it is not unfrequent that *God* is *provoked* to *anger* and *jealouſy*, according to ſcripture. My opponent will not argue, that we ought to underſtand thoſe ſcriptures as *ſtrictly* and *literally* true; no man, in his ſenſes, can believe them ſo, and yet believe the Almighty unchangeable. Suppoſing my opponent ſhould give his own opinion of this queſtion; I have no doubt but he would remove the objection, to all intents. I underſtand thoſe ſcriptures, as many others do, to be ſpoken according to the dark underſtanding of man, who is ignorant of the real character of God; and according to the repreſentations made by the law to the unreconciled mind. To admit, in a *ſtrict ſenſe* of ſpeaking, that *God* was ever *grieved* to the *heart*, for what he did himſelf, or for what his creatures do, is more than I can do, and believe in the perfections of a Supreme Being. St. James ſays, With God there is no *variableneſs* nor *ſhadow of turning*. This expreſſion is as ſtrong an indication of the *unchangeability* of the Almighty, as any that might be choſen. St. Paul informs us that God works *all things* after the council of his own will. Our being led by a *carnal* and *fleſhly mind*, is undoubtedly what the apoſtle meant, by *grieving* the *Holy Spirit;* as the motions or vibrations of the carnal man are oppoſed to thoſe of the heavenly; but that the eternal *Spirit* of God ever felt *grief*, is more than we can rationally

admit, as that would reduce the Almighty to a ſtate of ſuffering. It is very evident, that the ſcriptures repreſent the Almighty in extremely different characters; and I confeſs I cannot reconcile them in any other way, than by the two covenants, or what is the ſame, fleſh and ſpirit. Our ideas of God, while under the legal diſpenſation, walking in fleſhly minds, are conſonant to that character which the ſcripture repreſents our Creator in, as wrathful, filled with indignation towards us for our ſins, and every day angry. Thoſe ideas which the mind entertains of the father of all mercies, when enlightened by the ſpirit of the new man, and while walking in the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, which maketh free from the law of ſin, are altogether conſonant to that endearing character given in ſcripture, of our *Father* who is in *heaven*, who cauſeth his ſun to ſhine on the *evil*, and on the *good;* and ſendeth rain upon the *juſt*, and upon the *unjuſt;* who loved us *while we were yet enemies*, and ſent his Son to die, in atteſtation of his love to his creatures; who is good unto all, and whoſe tender mercies are over all the works of his hands; who is of one mind, and changeth not.

Says my opponent, if the Almighty govern all the affairs of mankind, according to his own appointment; if he were never diſappointed; ſuffers no violation of will; but does, in all things, and by all things, maintain and ſupport his own eternal ſyſtem of divine goodneſs, what room do we find, for the *neceſſity* of *atonement*, whereby *peace* is *made* by the *blood* of the *croſs?*

By this queſtion, I come to my ſecond general ſubject, viz.

ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

In my enquiries on this momentous ſubject, I ſhall, Firſt, examine three doctrinal tenets on atonement; from which, I ſhall beg leave to diſſent, and give my reaſons therefor.

Secondly, Show the neceſſity of atonement, and where ſatisfaction muſt be made.

Thirdly, Inquire into the perſonage and character of the Mediator, who makes the atonement, and his ability to perform the work.

Fourthly, Of atonement in its nature.

Chriſtian divines, in general, have agreed in ſuppoſing ſin to be an *infinite evil*, being a violation of an *infinite law*, and, therefore, that the law required an *infinite ſacrifice;* ſhort of which, no atonement could be made; that the tranſgreſſion of Adam brought the whole human race into the ſame ſituation of ſin and miſery, and ſubjected them all to the *infinite penalty* of an *infinite law*, which they had violated in their parent, before they individually exiſted.

After the above agreement, many different roads are taken; and divines of the greateſt abilities, and of the firſt rank among the literati, have drained the laſt faculty of invention, in plodding through the dark regions of metaphyſics, to bring up a *Samuel* to explain the *ſoleciſm* of *ſatisfying* an *infinite diſſatisfaction;*

The plan of redemption, as held by many, may be reduced to the following compendium. God, from all eternity, foreſeeing that man would ſin, provided a Mediator for a certain part of his poſterity, who ſhould ſuffer the penalty of the law for them, and that theſe elect ones, choſen by God from the reſt of mankind, will alone be benefitted by the atonement; that, in order that the

ſacrifice might be adequate to the crime, for which, the ſinner was condemned to *everlaſting*, or endleſs ſuffering, God himſelf, aſſumed a body of fleſh and blood, ſuch as the delinquent was conſtituted in, and ſuffered the penalty of the law by death, and aroſe from the dead. By this proceſs, the demand of the law was completely anſwered, and the debt due to Divine Juſtice, by the elect, was fully and amply paid. But that this atonement does not affect thoſe who were not elected as objects of mercy, but that they are left, to ſuffer *endleſsly* for what Adam did, before they were born. It is true, they are a little cautious about ſaying, that *God himſelf abſolutely died!* But they ſay, that Chriſt, who was crucified, was *really God himſelf*, which muſt, in effect, amount to the ſame thing. And in fact, if the Infinite did not ſuffer death, the whole plan falls, for it is by an *infinite ſacrifice* that they pretend to *ſatisfy* an *infinite diſſatisfaction.*

Why the above ideas ſhould ever have been imbibed, by men of underſtanding and ſtudy, I can but ſcarcely ſatisfy myſelf; their abſurdities are ſo glaring, that it ſeems next to impoſſible, that men of ſobriety and ſound judgment ſhould ever imbibe them, or avoid ſeeing them.

I have already ſufficiently refuted the idea of an infinite ſin, which opens to a plain path, in which the mind may run, and run clear of all thoſe perplexities which have ſerved to confuſe, rather than enlighten mankind.

If ſin be not infinite, the diſſatisfaction occaſioned by ſin is not infinite; therefore an infinite ſacrifice is not required. But, for the ſake of illuſtration, we will for a moment admit, that the doctrine of atonement ſtands on the ground over

which we have juſt gone. I will ſtate it as it is often ſtated by thoſe who believe it, which is by the likeneſs of debt and credit. The ſinner owed a debt to Divine Juſtice, which he was unable to diſcharge; the Divine Being cannot, conſiſtently with his honor, diſpenſe with the pay, but ſays, I muſt have what is my due; but as the debtor has not ability to pay the ſmalleſt fraction, Divine Wiſdom lays a deep concerted myſterious plan for the debt to be diſcharged. And how was it? Why, for God to pay it himſelf!

My neighbor owes me an hundred pounds; time of payment comes, and I make a demand for my dues. Says my neighbor, my misfortunes have been ſuch, that I am not the poſſeſſor of the ſmalleſt fraction of property in the world; and as much as I owe you, I am worſe than nothing. I declare to him, poſitively, that I will not loſe ſo much as a fraction of the intereſt, and leave him. A friend calls, and aſks me how I ſucceeded in obtaining my dues of my neighbor; I reply, my neighbor is not, nor will he ever be able to pay me any part of my demand. My friend ſays, he is ſorry that I ſhould loſe my debt. I anſwer, I ſhall not loſe it. I have very fortunately, in my meditations on the ſubject, thought of a method, by which I can avail myſelf of the whole, to my full ſatisfaction; and I think it is a method which no perſon in the world, but myſelf, could ever have diſcovered. My friend is curious, and impatient to know the mighty ſecret, never before found out. The reader may gueſs his confuſion, on my telling him, that, as I have that ſum already by me, I am now going to pay up the obligation, before the intereſt is any larger! This has been called the goſpel plan, which contains the depths of infinite wiſdom.

I ſhould be pleaſed to ſee, what I have never ſeen, profeſſors following ſuch example in obtaining what the poor widow, the fatherleſs, and the needy, owe them. But, ſays the advocate for the plan, a *diſtinction* ought to be made, *between* the *perſons* in the Godhead. It was the ſecond perſon in the Godhead, who paid this infinite debt, to the firſt; therefore, it is not altogether like a perſon paying his own demand. I ſay, in anſwer, if the firſt and ſecond perſons in the Godhead are not ſo eſſentially one as to make the debts due to one, belong equally to the other, and payment alſo, they are not ſo eſſentially one, as to be repreſented by two diſtinct perſons, related only by Adam, who are in co. in merchandiſe. But, for the ſake of carrying the argument ſtill further, I will admit this *variety* of perſons in an *infinite, indiviſible being!* And alſo the plan of atonement on the principle of the ſecond perſon's paying the demand to the firſt. And here it will be neceſſary to introduce the *third perſon* in the Godhead, as it is contended that the third perſon makes known to the debtor, what the creditor determines concerning him. Then the plan of the doctrine may be repreſented by the following ſimilitude: A owes B the ſum of one thouſand pounds; the time of payment comes, demand is made; A is not worth a farthing, neither is it in his power to raiſe a fraction of the money. B immediately commences a proceſs againſt A, of which, C, a friend of A's, being informed, goes to B, aſks him how large a demand he holds againſt A; B informs him, an hundred pounds, and the intereſt. And is A worth nothing? aſks C. Nothing, anſwers B. Would you make a deduction of twenty-five per cent, if you could have the money down? aſks C. Not the

leaſt deduction, anſwers B. You will, at leaſt, throw in the intereſt, ſays C. Not the ſmalleſt fraction, anſwers B. Well, ſays C, if you have no *mercy* on the *poor* and *diſtreſſed*, I will ſhare the *pleaſure* of *relieving* the *debtor alone;* counts out the money in full, and receives the obligation to beſtow on his friend, A. B ſends a ſervant immediately to inform A, that he has concluded to forgive him the debt. A is tranſported at the news, flies to tell his wife and children the tidings of mercy, and all join in praiſing ſuch heavenly benevolence. C comes in, the ſame moment, with the obligation in his hand; modeſtly gives it to A, deſiring him to accept it as a token of undiſſembled friendſhip. A is *confounded*, aſks C how he came by the obligation; C informs him, that he paid every farthing of the money for it, the creditor would not make the leaſt deduction. I leave the reader to judge, whether the creditor ſhowed any mercy to the debtor, and whether B's pretenſions of favoring A, do not wear the appearance of hypocriſy. It is contended by thoſe who hold to this debt, and the payment of it, that the ſalvation of the ſinner is by being forgiven; yet, they contend, that the debt is paid. But how I can forgive a man a debt, and oblige him to pay it, is more than I can ſee.

Again, admitting the ſyſtem true, I wiſh to inquire into the propriety of an innocent perſon's ſuffering, for one who is guilty. It is ſcripture, reaſon, and good law, never to condemn the innocent, in order to exculpate the delinquent. Suppoſing a foreign court ſends a perſon, who is old in conſpiracies and blood, to America, to lay a deep concerted plan to murder the Preſident of the union, and a number of the firſt officers in the

federal government, for purpoſes miſchievous to our political exiſtence; and he ſhould ſo far ſucceed, as to engage a number in his wicked deſign, and finally makes the attempt; his plans are diſcovered by government, and detected, but not until numbers have fallen a ſacrifice to his miſchievous endeavors. The leader of theſe ſeditious murderers, is taken and condemned to be executed; and the voice of every friend of juſtice and equity is againſt the criminal. But what would be the conſternation of the good people of the United States, on being informed, that the good preſident of the union, the man whom the people delighted to honor, was executed, in the room of this ſeditious perſon, and the wicked murderer ſet at liberty? Is it poſſible to conceive that there is a ſingle perſon in the world, who would call this a juſt execution? If it be ſaid, that the preſident freely offered himſelf in the room of the criminal, it alters not the caſe, in the eye of juſtice. If an innocent man can juſtly be put to death, becauſe he conſents to it willingly, a guilty one may be acquitted becauſe he prefers it. But it is further agreed, that the authority had power to raiſe the preſident from the dead, which done, renders the work juſt and glorious. I ſay, in anſwer, that if the authority had this power, it might as well have executed the real criminal, and raiſed him from the dead, as to perform this work on one who was not guilty. What is the moſt ſhocking of any thing, in this ſyſtem of atonement, is, the partiality repreſented in the Almighty; for, admitting the plan rational, as it reſpects thoſe circumſtances, in which I have ſhown its abſurdity, what can we find in ſcripture, or reaſon, that juſtifies ſuch infinite partiality in our Creator? or what can, in the

leaſt, ſerve as evidence to prove him poſſeſſed of it? Have we not reaſon to believe our Creator poſſeſſed of as much goodneſs as he has communicated to us? Can we rationally believe, that he is wanting, in thoſe principles of goodneſs which he has placed in our underſtandings? When he ſaw the whole progeny of Adam in the ſame ſituation, by reaſon of ſin, one no more guilty than another, why ſhould he propoſe a plan of mercy for ſome few of them, and diſregard the awful circumſtances of the reſt? The ſacred oracle declares God to be no reſpecter of perſons; if this be true, he is not a partial being. Jeſus taught the character of God to his diſciples, by turning their attention to nature, obſerving the equal diſtribution of rain and ſunſhine, on the evil and on the good, on the juſt and on the unjuſt. Suppoſing Joſeph had dealt out bread plentifully to two of his brethren in Egypt, and had ſtarved the reſt to death, would it have looked like impartiality? It is argued, that none of them deſerved a crumb from Joſeph, whom they had ſold; and if he pleaſed to give to one, and not to another, he had a right ſo to do. Then I ſay, he had a right to be partial. I am travelling through a large and extenſive wood, and many miles from any inhabitants; I find ten perſons who are loſt; they have been out of proviſions for ſeveral days; and having fatigued themſelves, in wandering from hill to hill, from ſtream to ſtream, ſtriving, to the utmoſt of their abilities, to find inhabitants; having given up all hopes of ever ſeeing their homes again, and having, in their minds, bid their wives and children a long farewel, they are waiting for hunger to do its laſt work! The moment I diſcover myſelf to them, with large ſupplies of wholeſome and rich proviſions, every eye

gliſtens with unexpected joy; the current of life ſtarts afreſh in their veins, and they all advance to meet me on their enfeebled hands and knees, with eagerneſs to receive the ſtaff of life! I haſten to improve the opportunity of ſhowing my ſovereignty and goodneſs; I feed five of them to the full, the other five, I neglect. They beg for the ſmalleſt cruſt, which I do not want, but to no effect. Thoſe whom I feed ſolicit me, every mouthful they eat, to beſtow ſome on their fellow ſufferers, but I refuſe. I tell them, however, not to conſtrue my conduct into *partiality*, but to learn my *power* and *ſovereignty* by it. The five whom I have fed, I aſſiſt out of the wood, and leave the reſt to their wants. My *conduct*, in the above affair, appears ſo much *blacker* than my *paper* is *white*, I chooſe rather to leave the reader to make his comments, than to write my own.

I inquire ſtill further, did the Almighty know, before he made man, that he would become a ſinner? Did he know that he would deſerve an endleſs puniſhment? If the anſwer be in the negative, it ſuppoſes God to be wanting in knowledge, and that he created beings at an infinite riſk, as he did not know what would be the conſequences. If the queſtions be anſwered in the poſitive, it proves that an infinite cruelty exiſted in God; for unleſs that was the caſe, he would never have created beings, who, he knew, would be infinitely the loſers by their exiſtence.

Thoſe who believe in the ſyſtem which I am examining, believe in the exiſtence of the Devil, whoſe exiſtence I have refuted in this work. I am willing, however, for the ſake of the argument, to admit the exiſtence of their God, and Devil likewiſe. But wiſh to inquire, which of them is, in

reality, the worſt being. God, when he created mankind, perfectly knew that ſome of them would ſuffer endleſs torment, for their ſins; he muſt, therefore, have intended them for that purpoſe. For, it is inconſiſtent to ſuppoſe, that the Almighty would create, without a purpoſe; and his purpoſe could not be contrary to his knowledge. The matter then ſtands thus, God created millions of beings for endleſs miſery, which they could not eſcape; the Devil is deſirous of having them miſerable, and does all in his power to effect it. Now, reader, judge between theſe two beings. Had this Devil been conſulted, by the Almighty, when he laid the plan of man's final deſtiny, I cannot conceive him capable of inventing one more eligible to his infernal diſpoſition, than this which I am now diſputing.

As reaſon will not conſent to the plan of God, as deſcribed in the foregoing ſcheme, I will ſhow that the ſcriptures equally oppoſe it. It is granted, that Jeſus Chriſt died for mankind, as the ſcriptures declare; but not in the way, in which thouſands have believed. But ſuppoſing he died inſtead of the ſinner, in the way which I diſpute, I ſtill wiſh to prove, that he died for the whole of Adam's poſterity, as much as he did for any. If Iſaiah did not believe that, that would be the caſe, I cannot reconcile his words to his opinion, which I find in chap. liii ver. 5, 6. "But he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniquities: the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him; and with his ſtripes we are healed. *All* we, like ſheep, have gone aſtray: We have turned *every one* to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us ALL." St. Paul muſt have been of this opinion, when he wrote to Tim-

othy, or his words are not expreſſive of his belief. See 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus; who gave himſelf a ranſom for all to be teſtified in due time." 1 Epiſtle General of John ii. 1, 2. "My little children, theſe things write I unto you, that ye ſin not, and if *any* man ſin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our ſins, and not for ours only, but alſo for the ſins of the *whole world*." Hebrews ii. 9. "But we ſee Jeſus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the ſuffering of death, now crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God, ſhould taſte death for *every* man." The above ſcriptures, with their connexions and correſponding paſſages, as fully prove that Chriſt died for ALL men, as any one thing can be proved from the bible. Now, as there is not, in all the ſcripture, a ſingle hint to the reverſe of theſe paſſages which I have introduced, it appears ſtrange and unaccountable to me, that any perſon, who profeſſes to believe the teſtimony of the bible, ſhould ever have entertained the idea, that what theſe paſſages ſay, is falſe, and that which is not ſaid, in contradiction to what is, is true!

Look, ye readers, and ſubmit to aſtoniſhment, at what has been believed in, as divine truth. An almighty, infinitely wiſe and good being, creates an innumerable multitude of rational intelligences; they rebel againſt him, and raiſe an infinite diſſatisfaction in his mind towards them; this infinite diſſatisfaction gets removed toward part of the offenders, by the ſacriſice of innocence! With the reſt, God is ſtill diſpleaſed; yet, he is almighty and infinitely wiſe, and employs his power and

wiſdom to make the works of his own hand as miſerable as their natures will bear; for being juſt ſuch creatures as he knew they would be, before he made them. But it is argued, that God's knowing what ſort of creatures men would be, did not influence them, in the ſmalleſt degree, to be what they are. Let this argument be granted. But did not God know what would influence men to be what they are? Anſwer, yes. Was it in his power to remove this influential cauſe? If it were, why did he not do it, if it were like to diſpleaſe him? If it were not in his power to prevent the miſchief, I wiſh to know whether it were in the creature's power to prevent it? If it were not in the power of either of them to prevent the operation of things in the way in which they have, and do take place, why is God's anger ſo warm againſt his poor impotent offſpring? It ſeems an unhappy circumſtance, for both Creator and creature. The Creator is not ſatisfied with his creatures; his creatures find themſelves introduced into an exiſtence infinitely worſe than none. I am born into this world of ſorrow and trouble; the firſt vibration of ſenſe is want; I endeavor to ſupply my wants, and to maintain my exiſtence, which my Maker has beſtowed upon me; but as ſoon as I come to years of underſtanding, I am told of an *infinite debt* which ſtands againſt me, which I owed thouſands of years before I was born; and that my Maker is ſo angry with me, and has been, ever ſince the debt was due, that he has prepared a furnace of endleſs flames to torment me in, according to the due requirements of juſtice! My father gives me his farm, and puts me in poſſeſſion of it; I am pleaſed, and prize it very highly. In conſequence of my poſſeſſion, I

paint to myſelf many pleaſing proſpects; but, to my mortification, a perſon comes and preſents me with a mortgage of my farm, for five times its value, the mortgage running ſo as to hold the poſſeſſor to clear it; I will leave the reader to ſay, whether my father was kind, or unkind. Yet, the circumſtance into which the Almighty has introduced millions of his creatures, is infinitely worſe, according to the doctrine which I am examining. It is argued, with much aſſurance, that God has a juſt right to do with his creatures as he pleaſes, becauſe he has it in his power ſo to do; and that he never does any thing, becauſe it is right; but what he does, is right, becauſe he does it.

If the above ſtatement be juſt, moral holineſs conſiſts in the power of action, and not in the diſpoſition that deſigns the action. If ſo, my argument in favor of ſin's exiſting only in the deſign of the actor, and not in the action, is groundleſs; and we are driven to ſay, that unholineſs, or ſin, is the *want* of power to perform an action; and holineſs conſiſts in having the power to do it. One man deſigns to murder another for his money, he makes the attempt, and fails; his ſin conſiſted in not having power to execute his deſign; but, in the deſign, there is no evil. On the other hand, he makes the attempt, and ſucceeds; here is no evil at all, becauſe he had power to do it. On this principle, every thing that can be done, is moral holineſs; and every thing that cannot be done, is ſin, or moral evil.

Here we are preſented with a picture the moſt to be dreaded, of any thing which the imagination of man is capable of inventing. Power moving on in front, exhibiting tyrannic majeſty in every action; and meagre juſtice in the rear, obſe-

quiouſly pronouncing all right! If theſe things be ſo, our ſenſes are nothing but mediums of deception; and all our experience has ſerved us no other purpoſe, than to make us more ignorant. Who is there in the world, poſſeſſing common ſenſe, that does not dread and revolt from power, in every inſtance, where they ſee it connected with an evil diſpoſition? Are we right, in wiſhing our enemies weak? We are, and that becauſe their ſtrength being directed by their wicked deſigns, gives us fear.

But, for the ſake of the argument ſtill further, let it be granted, that God being ſupreme, had a right to do, becauſe he had the power. And he creates millions of beings, whom he intends for endleſs torments, and puts his whole deſign into execution; and this is called ſupreme goodneſs. Now I wiſh to know, how a ſupreme evil could be deſcribed? All will grant, that evil is in oppoſition to good; then an oppoſite deſcription would be juſt. To create, with an intention to make eternally happy, and to put that deſign into execution, would be ſupreme evil! But, according to the doctrine which I am examining, God contains theſe two characters in himſelf, having created ſome for one purpoſe, and ſome for the other. It will be of no advantage to the reader to have the abſurdity of the above propoſition any more expoſed, than enough to have it rejected. I never heard, or read any argument to prove the propriety of the diſputed propoſition. It is a begged propoſition, and ſtands without the leaſt ſhadow of evidence from ſcripture or reaſon; but it requires no great ingenuity to ſee what the chimera was intended for; without it, the whole plan and ſcheme of atonement, which I am now examining, would fall, for want of foundation.

There are ſome of Paul's writings to the Romans, which have been uſed by divines, to prove the partial plan of ſalvation true, of which, I think it will be proper to take notice, in this place. Romans ix. 21, 22, has been made great uſe of, in order to prove, that God made ſome men veſſels of eternal diſhonor, and others veſſels of eternal glory. The words read as follow: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the ſame lump to make one veſſel unto honor, and another unto diſhonor? What if God, willing to ſhow his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long ſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction." In order that the reader may ſee, that the paſſage has not the meaning which has been generally attached to it, let him obſerve, that the two veſſels, mentioned in the text, are made of the SAME LUMP; which alſo may be ſeen in God's communication to Jeremiah, ſee Jeremiah, xviii. 3, 4. "Then I went down to the potter's houſe, and behold he wrought a work on the wheels, and the veſſel that he made of clay, was marred in the hand of the potter, ſo he made it again another veſſel, as it ſeemed good to the potter to make it." Obſerve, the firſt veſſel being marred was diſhonorable, and it marred IN the potter's hand. The potter did not make the veſſel perfectly ſound and good, and lay it away whole, and the veſſel mar itſelf afterwards; but it marred, while *in* the *hand* of the *potter*. The potter did not condemn the clay as good for nothing, becauſe it marred; he did not caſt it away and take other clay, to make another veſſel; but, of the ſame clay, made a veſſel as it ſeemed good unto him to make it. This veſſel not being marred, was a veſſel of honor. Here the reader may ſee

the power of God manifested, in making, of the same lump, a vessel of honor, and a vessel of dishonor.

The thread of the apostle's discourse to the Romans, in which he introduced the passage above written, was intended to show the distinction between law and gospel, or flesh and spirit; by turning to the eighth chapter, the reader will find himself assisted in the introduction of this particular. We then say, that as man stands in the earthly Adam, he is a marred vessel. Christ himself, when for us he was made a sin offering, in the fleshly nature, was "more marred than any man, and his form than the sons of men." But in his resurrection, he was a vessel of honor and immortal glory; "and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall, also, bear the image of the heavenly." Further, see the two vessels described in 1 Cor. xv. 42. "*It* is sown in *corruption*, *it* is raised in *incorruption*; *it* is sown in *dishonor*, *it* is raised in *glory*; *it* is sown in *weakness*, *it* is raised in *power*; *it* is sown a *natural* body, *it* is raised a *spiritual* body." Again, Romans xi. 7. &c. "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear) unto this day. And David saith, let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them; let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway."

On this passage, and others like it, is built the doctrine of limited salvation, by Jesus Christ, according to the fore-knowledge and predestination

of the Almighty. It is argued, that thoſe who are here called the elect, are thoſe for whom Chriſt died, and thoſe alone who will finally obtain ſalvation by him. But why any perſon ſhould make ſuch a miſtake, in reading this chapter, I am at a loſs. The ſalvation of the elect is not argued, in this chapter; but the certainty of the ſalvation of thoſe who were blinded, and the propriety of believing it, occupies the greateſt part of it. Obſerve the words next to thoſe I have quoted above, verſe 11, &c. "I ſay then, have they ſtumbled, that they ſhould fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall ſalvation is come unto the Gentiles, to provoke them unto jealouſy. Now, if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminiſhing of them, the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulneſs?" Again, verſe 15th, "For if the caſting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what ſhall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" Again, in his argument to the Romans, he endeavors to ſhow them, by the ſimilitude of the branches of olive trees, that they ought to believe that thoſe blinded ones, though broken off through unbelief, would be graffed in again. See verſe 24, "For, if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature, into a good olive tree; how much more ſhall theſe, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree?" The apoſtle ſeems deſirous to inſtruct the Roman church, and argues the point fervently; ſee verſes 25, 26. "For I would not brethren, that ye ſhould be ignorant of this myſtery, *(leſt ye ſhould be wiſe in your own conceits,)* that blindneſs in part is happened to Iſrael, until the *fulneſs* of the *Gentiles* be come in. And

ſo all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved; as it is written, there ſhall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and ſhall *turn away ungodlineſs* from Jacob." Compare the laſt verſe which I have quoted, with Levit. xxvi. 44, 45. "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not caſt them away, neither will I abhor them, to deſtroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their ſakes remember the covenant of their anceſtors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, in the ſight of the heathen that I might be their God: I am the Lord." And Iſaiah xlv. 25. "In the Lord ſhall *all* the ſeed of Iſrael be *juſtified*, and ſhall *glory*." Many like paſſages might be quoted, from various parts of the ſcripture; but, perhaps, the above will ſuffice for this particular purpoſe. More, of the like nature, will be noticed in the ſequel of this work.

The ſcriptures have been as much violated, to maintain the doctrine which I am examining, as good reaſon is, by ſuppoſing God to be ſo infinitely partial, as he muſt be, in the eye of reaſon, in order to be what the doctrine repreſents him.

I ſhall now invite the attention of the reader to another ſyſtem of atonement, which was undoubtedly formed, with a view to ſhun the abſurdities in the former, and to get rid of ſome of the conſequences that were naturally deducible from that idea of the ſufferings of Chriſt. This ſyſtem ſuppoſes, that the atonement by Chriſt was not intended for the ſalvation of any part of the human race; that its main end, and ſole object, was the glory of the Supreme Being, as manifeſted in his holy and righteous law. In ſupport of this plan, it is argued, that it is inconſiſtent, for

infinite wiſdom and goodneſs to prefer an inferior object to a ſuperior one; that all creation, when compared with the Creator, ſinks into nothing, bearing no poſſible proportion to the infinite Jehovah; of courſe, that God always has his own glory in view, as his ſupreme object, in all he does.

This plan agrees with the former, in ſuppoſing ſin to be of infinite magnitude, and deſerving of endleſs puniſhment; that, as the law of God is infinite, like himſelf, finite man is infinitely to blame for not fulfilling all its requirements; and that the penalty of the law is endleſs miſery, which miſery Chriſt ſuſtained; not with a view of acquitting the ſinner, nor in room and ſtead of the tranſgreſſor, as is ſuppoſed in the other plan; but for the honor of divine juſtice, and the glory of his Father. It is further argued, that by Chriſt's ſuffering the penalty of the law, juſtice is as fully ſatisfied, as if all mankind had been made miſerable for an eternity. And this being the caſe, it is now juſt and right for God to acquit as many of the ſinful race of Adam, as is conſiſtent with his grand object, which is himſelf; yet, by no means rendering it unjuſt for God to puniſh, to all eternity, as many as is neceſſary, in order for the ſatisfying of the ſame grand object.

I firſt enquire into the propriety of the argument, on which this plan of atonement ſeems to be founded; which is, that God always acts for his own infinite and incomprehenſible glory; never ſtooping ſo low, as to act with an intention for the good of his creatures.

1ſt. I aſk, is God as infinitely glorious as he can be, or not? If it be anſwered, that he is; then, if his object in all he does, is to augment

his own glory, he never has, nor will he ever accomplish his intention. If it be argued, that it is not to augment his own glory, but to secure it and maintain it in its proper splendor, it argues it to be of a perishable nature, and that it would decay, were it not for the continual vigilance of the Almighty, in preserving it. If it be argued, that neither of these objects is right, but that it is the manifestation of his glory to intelligent beings, which is the grand design or object of God, in all his acts, without any reference to the effect which this manifestation has on those to whom it is made, I say, the object has now dwindled into annihiiation; there is not the smallest imaginable atom of it left. To suppose, that any rational being can wish, or desire, to accomplish any piece of labor, without having any reference to the consequences, is too glaringly absurd, to need refutation. Now the nature of the proposition, which I am examining, confines the motive of Deity within himself, and himself from his creation. In order, therefore, to look at the Almighty as he is by this doctrine represented, we must look at him as destitute of a creation, and view him abstractly from all his creatures. But may I ask, what title to give that being of whom we speak? The name *Jehovah*, truly has reference to his self-existence, and to his character as the giver of existence also. The name *God*, implies a being who is worshipped. *Lord*, signifies a possessor. *I am that I am*, has reference to an unchangeable being, but does not determine a being of goodness. I ask, again, what do we know of an Almighty, only by his works? If his existence can ever be determined, by any other means, I am ignorant of the way. What do we know, but by our sen-

ſes? Have we any ſenſe of good, or evil, that does not concern created beings? We may ſay, if we pleaſe, that God acts for his own eſſential good, abſtractly from his creation; but what do we mean by it? An action, for the good of any being, preſuppoſes that being in want; and if in want, then not infinitely happy. If God be not infinitely happy, he never can be. I enquire, further, by what data, can we determine that God is a good being? Can we determine it by any other criterion, than by the effects of what he does, as it concerns his creatures? The truth undoubtedly is, that juſt as far as we can look into creation, providence and redemption, and ſee the harmony and beauty of them, and ſee that all were calculated for the good of created intelligences, whom theſe things concern, we are ſatisfied, that he, who conducts the whole, is a good being. And if we ſay he is *good*, without this underſtanding, we acknowledge a propoſition, for which, we are unable to adduce the ſmalleſt reaſon. Again, is it not wrong to make a ſeparation, where the Almighty does not? Is he not perfectly joined to his creation? Do we not live, move, and have our being in God? Were we not created *of his fullneſs?* Had Deity any thing of which to create beings, but his own eternal nature? I know it has been ſaid, that God created *all things* out of *nothing*, &c.; but ſuch an idea never will be imbibed by me, until I can form, in imagination at leaſt, a notion, of how much *nothing* it takes to make the leaſt imaginable *ſomething*. If all things were created of the infinite Jehovah, as great a part of his creation as we take from him, ſo great a proportion we take from his fulneſs. God never could be more than infinite, in his fulneſs; then,

to take the ſmalleſt creature from him, which he created *of* that infinite fulneſs, you have left ſomething leſs than infinity. Now, if it be argued, that God acts for the good of himſelf, conſidering his creatures to belong to his fulneſs, I am perfectly agreed: But, to ſay, that the Almighty has, or ever could have a motive, in action, that did not embrace every conſequence that could ariſe from what he did, would be limiting his omniſciency; or, to ſay, that he did not intend good, to all whom his acts concern, would be limiting his goodneſs, and an impeachment on his juſtice.

I have before, in this work, contended, that all the attributes, which we aſcribe to God, we call *good*, on account of the advantages which we derive from ſuch principles. We are told of a God who acts for his own benefit, abſtractly from his creation; and that, in millions of caſes, he finds it moſt for his glory to make his rational, hoping, wanting creatures endleſsly miſerable; and this is called *goodneſs*. We are likewiſe told of a devil, who acts for his own gratification, and who delights in making God's creatures miſerable; and this is called *badneſs*. But, for my part, according to ſuch ſtatements, the difference, between goodneſs and badneſs, is ſo ſmall, I can hardly diſtinguiſh it. It is profane, in my opinion, to attribute a diſpoſition to the Almighty, which we can juſtly condemn in ourſelves. A man, who ſhould act from ſuch a ſelfiſh principle as is attributed to God, would render himſelf wholly unworthy of the protection of common law. And ſhall we thus repreſent our kind and merciful Father, from whom ten thouſand ſtreams of goodneſs continually flow to his wanting and needy creatures? No; let every vibration of ſenſe within us acknowledge his bountiful hand, which is never cloſed.

I have already labored, in this work, to ſhow, that *ſin* is *finite*, and not committed againſt an *infinite law*. I ſhall, however, now call into examination a ſubject ſomething like it, which is, that of penalty; as it is contended, that the penalty of God's law is endleſs puniſhment, &c.

I firſt inquire, why does a legiſlature affix penalties to laws which it makes? Anſwer, the firſt reaſon is, the ſtrength and ſecurity of government. 2d. That the puniſhment may ſerve to reclaim the delinquent. 3d. That the puniſhment of a criminal may ſerve to deter others from the commiſſion of like crimes. 4th. In many caſes, to keep the delinquent, by confinement or death, from doing any more miſchief.

Now let us look into the government of an Almighty Being, and ſee how the matter of *penalty* will operate there. Obſerve the penalty is *endleſs miſery*. I aſk, is this neceſſary, to ſecure the government of an Almighty Being? Would his government be in danger, if this penalty were not enacted to his law? Suppoſing a legiſlature of men had the power in their hands, of cauſing all the community, on whom its laws were binding, to love their laws, in every requirement, and with vigilance to attend to the faithful diſcharge of their duties in all things, would it be neceſſary for them to enact penalties to their laws? Allowing the legiſlature to have ſuch power, who, in the world, would ſay, it is not beſt to exerciſe it; that it is better to have penal laws, and let the people have their wicked obdurate hearts, ſo that now and then we may have a poor criminal to execute? I can hardly believe, that any will contend, that *penalty* is *neceſſary* in the *law* of *God*, in order to ſecure his government. Is there any ſcruple reſpect-

ing God's power to turn the hearts of his creatures as he pleases? If there be not, then there is no need of a penalty in his law, in order for the security of his government.

2d. Is this penalty necessary, in order to reclaim the delinquent? Answer that is impossible. The *penalty* being *endless punishment*, it can have *no object in reclaiming the punished.* The execution of such a penalty on any of God's creatures, would prove the contractedness of his goodness, as no *possible good* could be communicated to a *victim* of such *punishment.* Divine truth says, *God* is *good* unto *all*, and his *tender mercies are over all the works of his hands.* To say, God is good to a creature of his, whom he irrevocably dooms to endless torments, is a violation of our senses; and no person, in a moment of sobriety, will believe it. It is then evident, that such a penalty would not be necessary to reclaim the sinner.

3d. Is it necessary to inflict such a penalty on the transgressor, in order to deter others from the commission of sin? Answer, no; for, according to the doctrine which I am examining, the first transgression committed, involved the whole human race in the delinquency; and an execution of such a penalty, would be the endless misery of the whole family of man; there would not have been one left to be deterred from sinning, or even to tell the news!

4th. Is such a penalty necessary, in order to keep the sinner from sinning any more? So far from that, this penalty would fix the delinquents in a situation, in which they could do nothing but sin, to an endless eternity. No moral being can be miserable as *suffering conscious guilt*, without sin; therefore, in order for endless misery to be inflicted, *endless transgression* is *necessary.*

Look, kind reader, and ſee what an abſurdity lies here. Becauſe a being has ſinned once, the law which he violated requires that he ſhould continue in tranſgreſſion! Well, he complies; will the law juſtify him? But, ſays the reader, I do not underſtand you. Why? the matter is plain; if a moral being cannot be miſerable, without ſin, he muſt continue in ſin, in order to be miſerable. Then, if God's law requires endleſs miſery, it requires endleſs tranſgreſſion! But, it is argued, that a *law* cannot *exiſt* without a penalty. This, undoubtedly, is an error. The *largeſt ſignification* of the *word law*, is *governing power*. See Rom. vii. 23. "But I ſee another *law* in my members, warring againſt the *law* of my mind, and bringing me into captivity unto the *law* of *ſin*, which is in my members." This *law* of *ſin* in the members, which brings the man into captivity, is undoubtedly the power of the fleſh, which luſteth againſt the ſpirit, that we cannot do the things we would. Now, I aſk, is there any penalty to this law? Does this *law* adminiſter any condemnation to thoſe who do not obey it? Moſt ſurely it does not. Then paſs to the eighth chapter and third verſe; "For the *law* of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus hath made me free from the law of ſin and death." This *law* is undoubtedly the *governing* power of the heavenly nature, which overcomes the carnal mind, and delivers the ſoul from the bondage of ſin. I aſk, again, is there any penalty to this law? Is there a diſpenſation of condemnation adminiſtered by this law of life? Truth ſays, the wages of ſin is death. Does this death flow from the *law* of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus? Surely not. "To be carnally minded is death." If carnal mindedneſs be that death, which is the wages of ſin, ſurely it does not

ſlow from the ſpirit of life; "To be ſpiritually minded is life and peace."

God's moral law is like himſelf, *love;* "God is *love*, and he who loveth, dwelleth in God, and God in him." It requires all moral beings to love God and each other; and the reaſon why it commands this, is, it is love itſelf. True that ſoul is miſerable that does not love God, and the reaſons are, *love* is the life and happineſs of the ſoul, and *hatred* is its death and miſery.

Although I think I have given unanſwerable reaſons, why I do not admit ſuch a penalty as I have examined, I will for the ſake of the argument ſtill further, allow it, and inquire into Chriſt's ſuffering it.

To ſay, that Chriſt *has ſuffered* ſuch a penalty, is a contradiction in terms, becauſe an endleſs duration has not, yet, expired. To ſay, that this penalty ever will be *ſuffered*, by Chriſt, or any other being, is another contradiction in words; for an endleſs duration will never expire. Then to ſay, that ſuch a penalty has been, or ever will be ſuffered, is erroneous.

If it be argued, that Chriſt was an *infinite* perſon, and, therefore, could ſuffer an endleſs puniſhment, in a few moments; I anſwer, it is not ſhunning the contradiction. If the poſition be moved, and the argument is, that he being *infinite*, could ſuffer as much, in a few moments, as *all* mankind would to an endleſs duration; I aſk, are there more *infinite* beings than one? All anſwer, no. I aſk, again, is it poſſible for that infinite being to ſuffer? Even from my opponent, the anſwer will be, that the infinite himſelf did not ſuffer; but that it was the finite nature which ſuffered, and was raiſed from the dead, by the infinite; that it was the *human*

nature which was made a ſin offering; and that the divine nature gave victory to the human, by raiſing it into an immortal life. Well then, the ſufferings were *finite*, and could by no means anſwer the requirements of an *infinite* penalty.

The particular difference, between this plan and the former, is in the *intentions* of the *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*. The former ſuppoſes, that Chriſt ſuffered, in room and ſtead of the ſinner, ſo as to acquit all thoſe from condemnation, for whom he died: This argues, that the intention of the ſufferings of Chriſt was not the ſalvation of ſinners; but, as I have before obſerved, the *glory* of the Supreme Being. But, that by the ſufferings of Chriſt, the law is perfectly magnified, and made honorable; and that it is juſt, for God to acquit as many of the ſinful race of Adam, as is conſiſtent with his glory; but does not render it unjuſt, for him to puniſh, endleſsly, as many as is neceſſary for the ſame grand object.

Now, admitting the penalty of the law to be endleſs, and that Chriſt ſuffered it in full, the *law* cannot now require the deſtruction of the offender; how then can we reaſonably argue, that it is for the *glory* of God to puniſh, when juſtice does not requre it? If juſtice do require it now, of *any*, it does of *all*. If it be argued, that divine juſtice does not require the endleſs happineſs or miſery of man, I ſay, it is not a law which concerns mankind; and if we ſay, God's will, in the miſery of mankind, extends farther than the requirements of his juſtice, it is ſetting the Almighty againſt himſelf. Again, admitting ſuch proviſions to be made, as render it conſiſtent with juſtice, that all ſinners ſhould be emancipated from death and miſery, does eternal love and mercy require leſs?

Suppoſing five hundred Americans are in ſlavery, at Algiers: Our Conſul demands the price of their redemption, per man; he is anſwered, the price of one, is the price of the whole; and the price of the whole, is the price of one; the ſum is five hundred dollars. This, the Dey ſays, is not a conſideration for the ſlaves, but to ſhow America, or the United States, his power, and the dignity of his government. Our Conſul obtains the money, and pays it. Now, reader, do you think he would confine the benefits of this ranſom-money, to a ſmall part of thoſe unfortunate Americans; and out of *five hundred*, ſend but *fifty* home to their *wives*, *children*, *country* and *friends*; and tell the remaining four hundred and fifty, that the money was his own, and he had a right to extend, or not extend the benefits of it, as he pleaſed; and that it was his pleaſure that they ſhould all wear out a miſerable life in ſlavery, where they might dream of liberty, but never enjoy it? The ſmalleſt degree of humanity would argue better things.

We have now examined the foundation of this plan of atonement, and it has removed out of our ſight; we have ſought carefully after the penalty of the law, and cannot find it; we have ſought for the ſatisfaction of ſuch penal requirements, admitting they did exiſt, and find them not; we have admitted, for the ſake of the query, that ſuch ſatisfaction did take place, and we have ſought for the conſequences which are argued, and find them inconſiſtent with ſuch premiſes.

Taking my leave of this plan of atonement, I ſhall introduce a third one, from which I ſhall alſo diſſent, and give my reaſons for ſo doing. The plan agrees with the former, in reſpect to the law, its penalty and the perſonage of him who makes

the atonement; but differs, in respect to the *intentions* of *God*, *in* the atonement. As far as the first transgression concerned mankind, it is believed that the atonement by Christ is fully efficacious; and that no man will, or can be miserable forever, on account of what is called *original sin*. And that, by virtue of the sufferings of Christ, Adam and *all* his posterity were immediately placed in a state of trial, or probation, after the *fall*, such as Adam was in, before, but with this difference, viz. man now knows good and evil, and is possessed of strong appetites to sin; but has, also, a portion of the divine Spirit, which is given to every man, for his profit, to assist him in opposing those appetites, and subduing them.

Those who believe in this plan, believe that it was in the power of Adam, as a moral agent, to have stood in a state of holiness and innocency; and that it is now in the power of every man, as a moral agent, to obtain the paradise which Adam lost. They do not admit, that Christ died for our *actual* transgressions, after we come to years of discretion; but of *these*, we must *repent*, and beg for *mercy*, and God will forgive, on our humble and sincere application. The sum of this plan of atonement, made salvation *possible* unto *all men*, but *certain* unto *none*. It argues, that it is the *will* of *God*, that *all* men should be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth; that *all* should repent of their sins, and receive the Redeemer on the reasonable terms upon which he is offered to us.

Those who believe in this plan, believe it possible for men to neglect those privileges, slight those merciful offers, and turn a deaf ear to all the warnings of the Spirit, until the day of their probation is ended, whereby all that the Saviour has

done, is made of no effect unto them. And that thousands will be thus neglectful, and be miserable as long as God exists; not, however, for the sin which Adam committed, but for their own personal transgressions.

Before I put the foregoing system of atonement under examination, I will take notice of the character of the Mediator, as believed in, by all those who hold to the several systems of which I have taken notice, as I have not examined that particular, in my inquiries on the other systems preceding the one under consideration. They all contend, that the Mediator is *really God*; that the Godhead consists of *three distinct persons*, viz. *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*; that these *distinct* persons are equal in power and glory, and *eternally* and *essentially one!*

The reader will observe my usual mode of reasoning, which is to admit, as truth, what I wish to oppose; and to oppose it, with the consequence which necessarily follows. For the sake of argument, then, I admit the foregoing statement of the character of Christ to be just; and then I contend, that if he be the *Son* of *God*, he is the *son* of *himself*, and is his own father; that he is no more the *Son* of *God*, than *God* is his *son!* To say, of two persons, exactly of the same age, that one of them is a real son of the other, is to confound good sense. If Jesus Christ were really *God*, it must be argued, that *God really died!* Again, if the Godhead consists of *three distinct* persons, and each of those *persons* be *infinite*, the *whole Godhead* amounts to the amazing sum of infinity, multiplied by three! If it is said, that neither of these three persons alone is infinite, I say, the *three together*, with the addition of a *million* more *such*, would not make an *in-*

finite being. But ſuppoſing we get over all thoſe abſurdities, with as much eaſe as a miſcalculation avoids the truth; and ſuppoſe that theſe three diſtinct perſons formed the grand council in heaven, on the ſalvation of man, after the firſt tranſgreſſion.

In this council, and on ſo momentous an occaſion, the firſt perſon addreſſes the other two, ſaying, the colony which we have juſt planted on our new made earth, has rebelled, and you know the penalty, which is endleſs miſery, muſt be immediately executed on the two delinquents, unleſs a diſpenſation can be deviſed more favorable to the offenders, and equally ſatisfactory to juſtice. As the attribute of juſtice, ſpake in the firſt perſon, that of mercy ſpeaks, in the ſecond, and propoſes a pardon. Juſtice oppoſes, and contends that his honor depends on the penalty's being put in execution. Mercy again replies, the ſecond perſon in the Godhead ſhall ſuffer the penalty due to ſin, and juſtice ſhall grant man a ſecond probation, in which he may ſecure the life, which he, by rebellion, loſt. That reaſonable conditions ſhould be propoſed, and the third perſon ſhould make them known to man, and give him proper directions how to fulfil them; and if man faithfully attend to theſe conditions, he ſecures his happineſs; if not, mercy makes no more requeſts in favor of the offender. To this, all agree; and it is regiſtered accordingly.

It ſeems, according to this plan, that man utterly failed, on the *firſt* trial, but now has the ſecond opportunity. I would aſk, is there any more certainty of his ſucceeding now, than there was before? Is it certain, according to this plan, that any of Adam's poſterity will obtain ſalvation? Is it not in the power of all men to neglect thoſe

conditions? If it be not, it deſtroys the nature of conditions, and of probation; if it be, then it is entirely uncertain, whether an individual ſoul will ever be ſaved by the goſpel plan.

I have before ſhown it erroneous to ſuppoſe, that any finite being could ſuffer an infinite puniſhment, in any period of time; and I think it is alſo granted, that an *infinite* being cannot *ſuffer*. But, admitting the ſyſtem of atonement to ſtand on the ground contended for, it was a matter of utter uncertainty, whether it would, in *any inſtance*, prove *efficacious*, as it reſpected the *ſalvation* of man.

A rich parent gives a large portion to his ſon, accompanied with good advice; the ſon turns prodigal, ſpends *all*, and gets into priſon for debt. The father ſtill loves the ſon, pays his debts, lets him out of priſon, ſets him at *liberty*, and gives him a thouſand pounds more, which is all he ever can give him, and tells him to be more prudent. The prodigal, no ſooner than he finds himſelf thus liberated, and in poſſeſſion of a handſome property, goes into the ſame error, which brought him to ruin before, and finally meets the ſame conſequences. The father has no more to give, and the ſon becomes a vagabond. I aſk, did the parent act the part of wiſdom, any more than the ſon did? If he had acted wiſely, would he not have ſaid to him, Son, I gave you much at the firſt; I gave you good advice; I told you, that induſtry and prudence alone would ſecure you from want; I told you, though your property were large, unleſs you put your money to intereſt, or into trade, it muſt dwindle; that if you threw away your time, in vain and fooliſh prodigality, the end would be what you have already experienced? And although I hoped better things of you, than

a total neglect of my admonitions, yet, I feared; and, for your good, have reſerved one thouſand pounds of what I intended to give you, which, had you been economical, I ſhould, by this time, have committed to your care. But, as you have conducted ſo fooliſhly, I muſt, for your benefit, keep the remainder of your portion, until you prove yourſelf a convert, from prodigality to economy.

If the Almighty were ignorant, at firſt, when he put man in poſſeſſion of privileges which he afterwards abuſed, it aſtoniſhes me that he ſhould riſk the laſt favor which he had to beſtow, on principles which he had juſt ſeen fail. It will undoubtedly be acknowledged, by all, that Jehovah knew, as perfectly before tranſgreſſion as afterward, what man would do, and how he would diſpoſe of the advantages which he had beſtowed on him. Then I aſk, if God knew how man would abuſe thoſe privileges, and knew he would be eternally miſerable, in conſequence, was it an act of kindneſs, in God, to grant man ſuch privileges? I aſk, again, was it poſſible for that to fail, which the Almighty perfectly knew would take place? The anſwer will be, no. Then, when we have conſolidated the whole down to its *real ſelf*, all the privilege which God gave to thoſe whom he knew would render themſelves objects of his diſpleaſure, was a *privilege* of incurring to themſelves endleſs miſery; I ſay more, he inſured it to them himſelf, by putting that into their hands, by which he knew it would be effected.

I give my child a *loaded piſtol*, which I tell him to diſcharge at a ſerpent, on his way where I have ordered him. I know perfectly well, when I give him the piſtol, that he will careleſsly *blow his own*

brains out with its contents, and *the ſerpent will go unhurt;* the child's end happens, accordingly. I leave the reader to judge, whether I am the murderer of my child; my *conſcience* would inform me.

The Mediator ſuffered the penalty of the law, to reinſtate man in a ſtate of *probation; God* made a revelation to mankind, for their inſtruction; he inſpired the ancient prophets, to ſpeak of the things of his kingdom; ſent his holy Spirit into the world, to lead and guide man into all truth; and all this is done, from the pure benevolence of God towards a ſinful world, for its everlaſting welfare, but *all* upon *uncertainties!* After all, man has it in his *power* to fruſtrate the whole plan of grace, and render it abortive! O! ye angels of celeſtial purity, had ye known this, ye would not have ſung, on the auſpicious birth-day of Emanuel, "*Great joy, which ſhall be unto all people.*"

On the other hand, it was poſſible for every ſon and daughter of Adam to accept of Chriſt, on the very eaſy terms of goſpel obedience, and thereby to have ſecured the heavenly kingdom. This being granted, who knows they will not do it? Things that are *poſſible, may be done;* and who can ſay, for certainty, that thoſe things which are poſſible, will not be effected? If it be an abſolute certainty, that any will finally fail of gaining the prize, it is alſo an *abſolute certainty*, that they have *no poſſible opportunity for it:* If there be an opportunity, and the prize be attainable by *all*, there is, at leaſt, ſome room for hope; and were it the *real chriſtian-hope*, it would be like an *anchor* to the *ſoul*, both *ſure* and *ſteadfaſt;* but being founded *in the creature*, and not *in God*, it is *wavering* and *doubtful.*

On this ſyſtem, it muſt be abſurd to argue the *certainty* of the *endleſs miſery* of *any* of the *family of*

man, as the *ſalvation of the whole is poſſible.* God, out of love to his creatures, made it *poſſible* for them *all* to obtain ſalvation; indeed, it is his will, that all ſhould be ſaved from their ſins; it is, alſo, the will of Chriſt, and of the Holy Spirit; it is the will of all holy beings in heaven, and of the ſaints on earth; prayers are daily offered up, from the altar of ſacrifice, for its accompliſhment: And if it be not done, the whole *Godhead* will be diſappointed; mourning, inſtead of rejoicing, will be the employment of holy angels, and the ſaints will be ſtung with the keeneſt ſenſations of grief.

No one will dare to ſay, he believes *God* can be *diſappointed*, in any of his purpoſes; therefore, thoſe who believe in the ſyſtem laſt examined, muſt be diſſatisfied with it, if their eyes ſhould ever be opened to ſee its conſequences.

Having examined thoſe ſeveral ſyſtems of atonement, in as conciſe a method as was convenient, and having given my principal reaſons for not adopting either, I now beg the attention of the reader to my ſecond inquiry, viz.

The neceſſity of Atonement, and where ſatisfaction muſt be made.

I have, already, entered my proteſt, againſt the neceſſity of atonement, on the principles upon which chriſtians have generally believed it, by ſhowing the finite nature of ſin, and the error of ſuppoſing that the law of God required the endleſs miſery of mankind, as a penal requiſition.

Atonement ſignifies *reconciliation*, or *ſatisfaction*, which is the ſame. It is a being *unreconciled to truth and juſtice*, which needs *reconciliation*; and it is a *diſſatisfied being* which needs *ſatisfaction.* Therefore,

I raiſe my inquiry on the queſtion, Is *God* the *unreconciled* or *diſſatisfied party*, or is it *man?*

For our aſſiſtance on this queſtion, let us turn our attention to God's dealings with Adam on the day of tranſgreſſion, and the conduct of Adam, the tranſgreſſor. After Adam had eaten of the forbidden fruit, his eyes opened to the knowledge of good and evil, and he found himſelf naked, and endeavored to hide himſelf from God, which he certainly would not have done, had he conſidered his Maker his friend. Sin produced two errors in the mind of Adam, which have been very incident to mankind ever ſince; the firſt was, he believed *God* to be his enemy, in conſequence of diſobedience; and, ſecondly, that he could reconcile his Maker, by works of his own. The firſt of theſe errors we diſcover, from Adam's endeavoring to *hide* from *God;* and the ſecond is ſeen, in his endeavoring to clothe himſelf with the works of his own hands. It is plain, that a material *change* had taken place in *Adam;* but can we prove, that any *alteration* happened in God? It is very evident, that Adam was unreconciled to God; but it is equally as evident, that God was not unreconciled to him. God's calling Adam, in the *cool* of the day, and aſking him where he was; clothing him with a garment of ſkins, and promiſing that the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe the ſerpent's head, are beautiful repreſentations of the parental love and fatherly care of the Creator. It ought to be obſerved, that God pronounced no curſe on Adam, but on the ſerpent. If the Almighty had been *unreconciled* or *diſſatisfied* with his creature man, in room of promiſing him a final *victory* over the *ſerpent*, the *curſe* would undoubtedly have *fallen* on the *object* of his *diſpleaſure*.

To ſay, that God loved man any leſs, after tranſgreſſion, than before, denies his *unchangeability;* but, to ſay, that man was wanting in love to God, places him in his real character. As God was not the unreconciled party, no atonement was neceſſary for his reconciliation. Where there is diſſatisfaction, it preſuppoſes an *injured* party; and can it be hard to determine which was *injured* by *ſin*, the *Creator* or the *ſinner?* If God were unreconciled to man, the atonement was neceſſary, to *renew* his *love* to his *creature;* but if *man* were the *unreconciled*, the *atonement* was neceſſary, to *renew* his *love* to his *Creator*. The matter is now ſtated ſo plainly, that no perſon, who can read, can miſtake.

I ſhall now endeavor to prove, from ſcripture, that the atonement by Chriſt was the *effect*, and not the *cauſe* of God's love to man. See St. John iii. 16. "For God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth on him might not periſh, but have everlaſting life." According to this paſſage, nothing is more plain, in ſcripture, than the idea, that what Chriſt did for ſinners, was a conſequence of God's love to them. Again, verſe 17. "For God ſent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be ſaved." This paſſage ſays, that *God* did not ſend his Son into the world to condemn the world; but, according to the general idea of atonement, *Chriſt* ſtood as the *proxy* of *man*, and the world was tried in him, and condemned in him, and in him ſuffered the penalty of the law which man had tranſgreſſed. It is alſo ſaid, in the text, that Chriſt was ſent, that the world through him might be ſaved; which, if true, goes to prove, that the Father's object, in Chriſt's coming into the world, was the ſalvation

of the ſinner, and not for the removing of any diſſatisfaction in himſelf towards them. Again, ſee Rom. v. 8. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were *yet ſinners*, Chriſt died for us." As the *death* of *Chriſt* is here ſpoken of as a *commendation* of God's love to us, it ought to be conſidered as an *effect* and not the *cauſe* of that love. Again, 1 epiſtle of John iv. 9. "In this was manifeſted the love of *God* towards us, becauſe that God ſent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." If Chriſt's coming into the world, were a manifeſtation of God's love to us, this love muſt have exiſted before he came, and his coming was an *effect* produced by it. Verſe 10. "Herein is *love*, not that *we loved God*, but that *he loved us*, and ſent his Son to be the propitiation for our ſins." Verſe 19. "We love him becauſe he *firſt* loved us."

From thoſe paſſages, and many more which might be quoted, to the ſame effect, it is eaſy to learn, that, what the Mediator did for ſinners, was the *conſequence*, and not the *cauſe* of God's love to us. God being infinite in all his glorious attributes, he can by no means love, at one time, and hate the ſame object, at another. His divine omniſciency comprehended all the events of time and eternity; therefore, nothing could take place, to remove his love from an object on which it was placed. The Almighty had no occaſion to diſlike Adam, after tranſgreſſion, any more than he had even before he made him; for, he knew as well then, that he would ſin, as he did after it was actually done. The reaſon that we mortals love an object, at one time, and diſlike it, at another, is the weakneſs of our underſtandings; we have not always the ſame view of the ſame object. We may

ſlight an object of great value, its excellencies being out of our ſight; and we may ſet our affections on one of no value, by erroneouſly attaching a value to it which it does not poſſeſs. But the Infinitely Wiſe is ſubject to no miſtakes; he comprehends the whole futurition of all moral beings, and loves them as his own offspring, with a love conſiſtent with his immutable exiſtence. Therefore, it is evident, that God was not the unreconciled, and, of courſe, did not require an atonement to reconcile himſelf to his creatures.

Let us now turn on the other ſide, and ſee if man be not unreconciled to God; and if it would not be more reaſonable, to reconcile man to his Maker, than to reconcile God to the ſinner. See Pſalm xiv. 2, 3. "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to ſee if there were any that did underſtand, and ſeek God. They are all gone aſide; they are all together become filthy: there is *none* that *doeth good, no not one.*"

The apoſtle Paul, in the third chapter of Romans, giving a general deſcription of mankind, introduces it with the paſſage from Pſalms, which I have juſt quoted, and continues it by an aſſemblage of various paſſages, ſee verſe 13, &c. "Their throat is an open ſepulchre; with their tongues, they have uſed deceit; the poiſon of aſps is under their lips; whoſe mouth is full of curſing and bitterneſs; their feet are ſwift to ſhed blood; deſtruction and miſery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." It is very evident, that the apoſtle meant to exclude none from this deſcription, as the reader may learn from verſe 19, "Now we know, that what thing ſoever the law ſaith, it ſaith to them who are under the law; that

every mouth may be ſtopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Again, chap. v. verſe 12. "Wherefore, as by one man, ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin, and ſo death paſſed upon all men, for that all have ſinned." That the ſcriptures abundantly prove, that *all* men are ſinners, and in an *unreconciled* ſtate, conſidered under the law, or in the earthly nature, will not be diſputed by any. Then it is certainly *man*, that needs *reconciliation*. Men, while dictated by a carnal mind, are *diſſatisfied* with *God;* they accuſe him of being an hard maſter, reaping where he has not ſown, and gathering where he has not ſtrawed. They think on the Almighty, but deſire not the knowledge of his ways. They behold no beauty in him; he appears as a *tyrant*, regardleſs of the happineſs of his creatures. A conſciouſneſs of ſin, without the knowledge of God, repreſents *Deity* as *angry*, and full of *vengeance;* in which ſenſe, many ſcriptures are written, as I have before obſerved. How often do we find, that *God* has been provoked to wrath and jealouſy, and his fury raiſed to a flame againſt the ſinner? And how often do the ſcriptures repreſent him repenting of his anger, and growing calm! All theſe ſcriptures are written according to the circumſtance of the creature, and the apprehenſions which the unreconciled entertain of God. Viewing man in this ſtate of unreconciliation to God, and holineſs, it appears evidently neceſſary, that he ſhould *receive* an *atonement* productive of a *renewal* of love to his Maker. Without atonement, God could never be ſeen as he is, "altogether lovely, and the chiefeſt among ten thouſand;" nor could he be loved with the whole heart, mind, might and ſtrength. How often are men grum-

bling at Providence, that things ſhould be governed as they are? How often are men diſpleaſed at the Supreme Being himſelf? What an *infinite* number of hard ſpeeches have ſinners ſpoken againſt God? All which argue the neceſſity of atonement, whereby thoſe maladies may be healed.

What an infinite difference there is between the All-gracious and Merciful, and his loſt and bewildered creatures? He, all glorious, without a ſpot in the whole infinitude of his nature; all lovely, without exception, and loving, without partiality. Who can tell the thouſandth part of his love to his offspring? And this invariably the ſame through every diſpenſation, without the ſmalleſt abatement. But what can we ſay of man? Loſt in the wilderneſs of ſin, wandering in the by-paths of iniquity, loſt to the knowledge of his heavenly Benefactor, and diſſatisfied with his God; he goes on grumbling and complaining, attributing the worſt of characters to the moſt merciful, and entertaining no regard for the fountain of all his comforts. God never called for a ſacrifice to reconcile himſelf to man; but loved man ſo infinitely, that he was pleaſed to bruiſe his Son for our good, to give him to die, in *atteſtation* of love to ſinners.

The belief, that the great Jehovah was offended with his creatures to that degree, that nothing but the death of Chriſt, or the endleſs miſery of mankind, could appeaſe his anger, is an idea that has done more injury to the chriſtian religion, than the writings of all its oppoſers, for many centuries. The error has been fatal to the life and ſpirit of the religion of Chriſt in our world; all thoſe principles which are to be *dreaded* by men, have been believed to *exiſt* in *God;* and profeſſors

have been moulded into the image of their Deity, and become more cruel than the uncultivated ſavage! A perſecuting inquiſition is a lively repreſentation of the God which profeſſed chriſtians have believed in, ever ſince the apoſtacy. It is every day's practice to repreſent the Almighty ſo offended with man, that he employs his infinite mind in deviſing *unſpeakable tortures*, as retaliations on thoſe with whom he is offended. Thoſe ideas have ſo obſcured the whole nature of God from us, that the capacious religion of the human mind has been darkened by the almoſt impenetrable cloud; even the tender charities of nature have been frozen with ſuch tenets, and the natural friendſhip common to human ſociety, has, in a thouſand inſtances, been driven from the walks of man. But, ſays the reader, is it likely, that perſecution ever roſe from men's believing, that God was an enemy to wicked men? Undoubtedly; for, had all profeſſors of chriſtianity believed, that God had compaſſion on the ignorant, and thoſe who are out of the way, how could they have perſecuted thoſe whom they believed in error? But, with contrary views, thoſe who profeſſed to believe in Chriſt, who profeſſed to be the real diſciples of him who taught his diſciples to *love* their *enemies*, have been the fomenters of perſecution; they have perſecuted *even unto death*, thoſe who could not *believe all the abſurdities* in *orthodox creeds*. It may be aſked, if thoſe animoſities did not ariſe from pride, ambition and carnal mindedneſs? I anſwer, yes; and ſo does the *God* in whom *perſecuting chriſtians believe*, for they form a God altogether like unto themſelves; therefore, while they vainly fancy they are in the ſervice of the true God, they are following the dictates of

pride and unlawful ambition, the natural productions of a carnal mind? and atonement is the only remedy for the evil.

Men are diſſatisfied with the Almighty and his providence; they are diſſatisfied with, and are enemies of one another; whereas our true happineſs conſiſts in loving God, and our neighbors. Men in poſſeſſion of vile appetites, purſue with greedineſs, their gratification; but ſtill, they retain their wants, their ſouls are allied to heaven and holineſs, and can never be happy without them. They are conſcious of ſin, and feel condemnation reſting on their minds; they look forward to the awful ſcene of diſſolution, and their ſouls ſtart back with horror. *Death* is the *King of terrors* to the unreconciled; how awful are the thoughts of death to thoſe whoſe hopes are only the feeble productions of their fears and wants, unſupported with divine evidence! O, how neceſſary is atoning grace, on ſuch an occaſion, whereby a divine confidence may be enjoyed; the value thereof cannot be eſtimated by earthly treaſures; all the ſhining duſt of India, and the riches of the ſouth, are poverty when compared with the riches of a reconciled mind.

Without atonement, God's glorious deſign, in the everlaſting welfare of his offſpring, man, could never be effected; the ordination of an infinitely merciful God could never be carried into effect. The Almighty muſt not be deprived of the means of accompliſhing his gracious deſigns. We read of his *covenant* with day and night, which cannot be broken; but it would be broken at once, ſhould the cauſes ceaſe that produce their changes. So of the *covenant* of eternal mercy, the teſtament of eternal life, it muſt

be put in force by the death of the teſtator, and its life and immortal glory be brought to light through his reſurrection. Let it be underſtood, that it is man who receives the atonement, who ſtands in need of reconciliation, who, being diſſatisfied, needs ſatisfaction; and not place thoſe imperfections and wants in him who is infinite in his fulneſs; and the doctrine of atonement may be ſought for in the nature of things, and found to be rational to the underſtanding.

That *man receives* the *atonement*, was evidently the opinion of St. Paul, ſee Romans v. 11. "And not only ſo, but we alſo *joy* in *God*, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom *we* have now *received* the *atonement*." Were there a ſingle paſſage in the ſcriptures that would reach *half as far*, in proving that *God* received the atonement, as the one juſt quoted does to prove that *man* received it, the matter might be conſidered more diſputable than it now is.

We read, that men are enemies to God, by wicked works, which teaches us that *enmity* is wickedneſs: Should we then dare to ſay, that God is our enemy? It is wrong for us to be enemies even to thoſe who injure us, much more to thoſe who never had it in their power to do us any harm. I wiſh to aſk, did any of God's creatures ever *injure him?* Surely not. Why then does he turn our enemy? He commands us to love our enemies, that we may be like him; but if *he hate his enemies*, *we muſt hate ours*, if we would be like *him*. If he be *not our enemy*, *he* needs *no atonement*. But if *men* are *enemies* to *God*, *they need* an *atonement* to bring them to love him who loves them.

Here the reader will obſerve that we ſhun thoſe difficulties which have repreſented the goſpel of

Chriſt ſo inconſiſtent. We now view the Almighty the ſame, yeſterday, to day and forever; by no means changed in his diſpoſition towards his creatures, but always deſigning and working all things for their good. Here is no need of the ſelf-contradictory notion of altering an unalterable being; of ſatisfying an infinite diſſatisfaction; of reconciling a being who was never unreconciled; of producing love in love itſelf; of cauſing an eternal unchangeable friend to be friendly, or of offering a ſacrifice to the eternal father of our ſpirits, to cauſe him to love and have mercy on his offspring.

How much more reaſonable it is, to ſuppoſe *ourſelves* in need of thoſe alterations. But unhappily, men have looked at Deity through the medium of a carnal mind, and have formed *all their* evil tempers in *Jehovah;* like the deceived aſtronomer, who fancied he ſaw a monſter in the ſun, occaſioned by a fly on his glaſs. The creature being in the medium of ſight, was ſuppoſed to be in the object beheld; and though it was ſmall in itſelf, and would have appeared ſo, could it have been ſeen where it was; yet, carrying it into the ſun, it magnified to an enormous ſize. So it is with our vile and ſinful paſſions, could we behold them in ourſelves, and view them as they are, they would appear in their finite and limited ſphere; but the moment we form thoſe paſſions in Deity, they magnify to infinity. Let a council of aſtronomers be called, who are all deceived by the fly; let them conſult on the bigneſs of the monſter, calculate how long it has been growing, and how ſoon it may wholly abſorb the ſun; let them endeavor to account for its cauſe, and analize its conſtitution, inform us of the degrees of

heat its lungs ſuſtain, and how many degrees hotter it is than iron can be heated in a furnace. But here is room for diſagreement, which may give riſe to great diſputations. To one, it appears much larger than to another; they cannot judge alike, with regard to its age, nor how much larger it will grow; ſome are ready to diſpute its being a living creature, fancying it may be an opaque body. They are all agreed, that there is a phenomenon in the ſun, but diſpute, and even quarrel, about its peculiarities. What would become of all their calculations, the moment they ſhould diſcover the fly? All would be gone, at once, and the ſun would be relieved of the burden of ſo ponderous a monſter.

How many various calculations have Divines made, on the *fury* and *wrath* which they have diſcovered in God! How much they have preached and written, on the awful ſubject; and how many ways they have invented, to appeaſe ſuch wrath and vengeance! When we come to ſee the error, and find thoſe principles in ourſelves, all thoſe notions vaniſh at once. The fly on the glaſs might eaſily have been removed, or deſtroyed; but had there been a monſter in the ſun, what calculations could mortals have made, to remove it? Enmity in man may be overcome with love; but, did it exiſt in God, it muſt be infinite and eternal.

To conclude, the ſuppoſition, that Deity receives the atonement, or any poſſible advantage from the goſpel plan, whereby an alteration is effected in him, for the better, amounts to the inexplicable abſurdity of making omniſcience more wiſe, omnipotence more powerful, juſtice more juſt; and of giving love the power of loving, of making mercy more merciful, truth more true, and good-

neſs better ; for theſe are the ſeven ſpirits of God, which are in all the earth, and they are without the ſhadow of turning.

Having ſhown, as I hope, to the reader's ſatiſfaction, the neceſſity of atonement, and where ſatisfaction muſt be made and reconciliation take place, I ſhall paſs to make ſome inquiries into

The perſonage of the Mediator who makes the Atonement, and his ability for performing the work.

I have already ſtated ſome of the abſurdities contained in the opinions of moſt chriſtians, reſpecting the Mediator ; I ſhall now be a little more particular on the ſubject.

I ſhall contend, that the Mediator is a *created dependant* being. That he is a created being, is proved from Rev. iii. 14, where he is ſaid to be "the beginning of the creation of God." His dependancy is proved, by his frequent prayers to the Father. That he acknowledged a ſuperior, when on earth, is evident, from many paſſages which might be quoted. See St. John v. 19. Chriſt here ſays, "The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do." He acknowledged a ſuperior in knowledge, ſee Matthew xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." This paſſage implies, that he did not know of that day himſelf. St. Mark is ſtill more explicit, ſee chap. xiii. 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father." And further, that he acknowledges a ſuperior, even in his riſen glory, may be proved from his own words to his ſervant John, on the Iſle of Patmos, ſee Rev. iii. 12. "Him that overcometh, will I

make a pillar in the temple of *my* God, and he ſhall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is new Jeruſalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name." Four times, in the above paſſage, he acknowledges a being whom he worſhips. Again, ſee Pſalm xlv. 7. "Thou loveſt righteouſneſs and hateſt wickedneſs, *becauſe* God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy fellows." The reader will obſerve, I have ventured to put the word *becauſe*, in room of the word *therefore*, in this quotation; but I have not done it, without the authority of a former tranſlation. The difference is ſo eſſential, I cannot diſpenſe with it. Obſerve, the writer of the Pſalm addreſſes one God, and ſpeaks, in his addreſs, of another, ſee verſe 6, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This God is dependant on another, expreſſed in the 7th verſe, *Becauſe* God, thy God hath anointed thee, &c. That the names, *God*, *Lord*, and *everlaſting Father*, are applied to Chriſt, I ſhall not diſpute; neither ſhall I diſpute the propriety of it; But I do not admit, that they mean the ſelf-exiſtent Jehovah, when applied to the Mediator. In the quotation from the Pſalm, Chriſt is ſaid to be anointed *above his fellows*. Fellows are equals. Who are Chriſt's *equals?* Perhaps the reader may ſay, they are the Father and the Holy Spirit; but I can hardly believe, that Chriſt was anointed with the oil of gladneſs above his Father, neither do I believe any one will contend for it. I am ſenſible, that God ſpeaks, by the prophet, of ſmiting the man who is his *fellow;* but this fellowſhip muſt be different from the one juſt ſpoken of, and ſtands only in an official ſenſe. The

reader will then aſk, if I would conſider the Mediator no more than equal with men? I anſwer, yes, were it not, that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows. See Phillippians ii. 9. "Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." For this exaltation and name, he was dependant on his Father, and received them from him. This name, which is above every name, is the name of God, named on Jeſus. It will be ſaid, Chriſt taught the people, that *he* and his *Father* were *one*. I grant he did, and if that prove him to be eſſentially God, the argument muſt run farther than the objector would wiſh to have it. See St. John xvii. 11. Chriſt prays that his diſciples may be *one*, even as *he* and the *Father* are *one*. The oneneſs of the Father and Son, is their union and agreement in the great work which he has undertaken; and he prayed that his diſciples might be as well agreed in the goſpel of ſalvation, as he and his Father were, ſee verſe 18. "As thou haſt ſent me into the world, ſo have I alſo ſent them into the world." The Father of all mercies ſent his Son Jeſus into the world, for a certain purpoſe; and there was a perfect agreement between them, in all things. He ſays, he came not to do his *own will*, but the *will* of *him* who ſent him. And again, My meat and drink, is to do the will of him who ſent me, and to finiſh *his* work.

The Preſident of the United States ſends a miniſter to negociate a peace at a foreign court; this miniſter muſt conduct according to the authority which he derives from him, by whom he is ſent; and as far as he does, he is, in his *official character*, the *power* that ſent him. It is evident, Chriſt *re-*

ceived the *power* which he exercifes in the work which he hath undertaken, and that his *kingdom* was *given* to him, which goes to prove, he did not eternally poffefs them ; fee Dan. vii. 14, "And there was *given* him dominion and glory, and a kingdom." According to the prophecy here quoted, the dominion, glory and kingdom of Chrift were *given* him. The people whom he is to rule are *given* him, fee Pfalm ii. 8. "Afk of me, and I fhall *give* thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoft parts of the earth for thy poffeffion." St. Matthew xxviii. 18. Jefus faith, "All *power* is *given* unto me in heaven and earth." Chap. xi. 27. "All things are *delivered* unto me of my Father." Thefe and many more paffages are found in facred writ, in fupport of the dependance of the Mediator on the Supreme Eternal, and that he derives his power and glory from him. But if Chrift be effentially God, all thofe fcriptures feem without juft fignification.

Chrift is faid to be the "image of the invifible God, and the firft born of every creature." His being the *firft born* of every creature, agrees with his being the *beginning* of the *creation* of God. It is plain to me, from fcripture, that the Mediator is the firft human foul which was *created*, as Adam was the firft man that was formed ; and that he is, *in fpirit*, the Father of every human creature, as much as Adam is *in* the *flefh*. Therefore, Chrift faith, as it is written, "Behold I and the children that thou haft given me."

It is written, that man was created in the *image* of *God ;* and, by the light of the gofpel, St. Paul ventured to affert, that Chrift was this image. The reader will do well to obferve, that the *image* of a perfon, and the *perfon*, are not effentially one, but

ſome knowledge of a perſon may be obtained by his true image. Chriſt being the image of God, it is by him we learn the nature of the Father. Chriſt ſaith, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him." Again, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." St. Paul is particular, on this ſubject, in his 1ſt Epiſtle to Timothy, ſee chap. ii. verſe 5. "For there is *one God*, and one Mediator between God and men, the *man* Chriſt Jeſus." It ſeems, by this teſtimony, that St. Paul was a ſtranger to the notion of Chriſt's being *eſſentially* God, as it would be improper to call him a man, were that the caſe. If it be argued, that Chriſt is God and man both, I aſk, was it the *whole* divine nature which conſtituted the divinity of Chriſt? If this queſtion be anſwered in the affirmative, I deſire to know where that divinity is which conſtitutes the other two perſons in the Godhead. If the queſtion be anſwered in the negative, and it be argued, that the divinity which Chriſt poſſeſſed was an emanation from Jehovah, it is coming directly to what I contend for, viz. that he is a created being.

As we have ſeen, from the prophecy of Daniel, that Chriſt *received* his kingdom; ſo we are taught, by St. Paul, that he will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, when he has accompliſhed the grand object of his reign, ſee 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. "Then cometh the end, when he ſhall have *delivered* up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he ſhall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he muſt reign, until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he ſaith, all things are put under him, it is manifeſt that he

is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be *ſubject* unto him that put all things under him, that *God* may be *all* in *all*."

Enough, perhaps, is written, on this part of my query, to make the matter plain to the reader, although much more might be quoted from the ſcriptures, in ſupport of what I have argued.

I next inquire, has the Mediator power, or ability, to perform the great work of atonement, which is the reconciliation of the world to God? Thoſe ſcriptures, with their connexions, which I have quoted to prove the Mediator's dependency, abundantly prove the ſufficiency of his power to accompliſh the work in which he is engaged. If all power in heaven and earth be committed to Chriſt, no doubt can be entertained of its ſufficiency. If the whole ſyſtem of law in moral nature be ſubſervient to the deſigns of the Redeemer, and if he hold in his hands the power of moral government, it certainly muſt be at his option, whether men ſhall be reconciled to God, or not.

It may not be amiſs to inquire, in this place, whether men, in their individual capacity, have the power of moral government? If they have, the great work of reconciliation might be performed by them, which would render the miſſion of Chriſt unneceſſary. We ought not to ſuppoſe the Almighty ever purpoſed more than one way to produce the ſame event; if he have given ability to each individual to effect a complete reconciliation in himſelf, it is not conſiſtent to believe that this work of reconciliation will be done by a Mediator; but if the work of reconciling *all things* to God be conſigned to Chriſt, it is not reaſonable to

believe we have power to perform it ourſelves. And I think it will not be deemed admiſſible, that we have power to hinder this work of reconciliation, as that would, in effect, deny the truth of all power being given to Chriſt. We ought to conſider, that Chriſt was by no means ignorant of man; that he needed none to teſtify of man, as he knew what was in man. He knew the moral diſtance which man had wandered from God, he knew all the expenſe of recovering him to holineſs and happineſs; and it appears rational, that he knew whether he poſſeſſed ability to defray this expenſe or not; and if he knew he did not poſſeſs this ability, he would not have undertaken it. We ought not to ſuppoſe the Mediator would act as unwiſely as a man who undertakes to build a large houſe, without firſt counting the coſt, to know if he be able to finiſh a building ſo expenſive; or, as a king would do, who ſhould make war on another king, without firſt conſulting whether he were able to contend with the double numbers which his adverſary commanded.

St. Paul, writing to the Coloſſians, ſaith, of Chriſt, he is the firſt born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence; for it pleaſed the Father, that in him all fulneſs ſhould dwell; and that the Father had made peace, through the blood of his croſs; and then informs them for what this peace was made, ſee chap, i. verſe 20. "By him to reconcile *all* things unto himſelf: by him, I ſay, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." In Iſaiah ix. 6, we have a beautiful prophetic teſtimony of the power and kingdom of the Saviour. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a ſon is given, and the government ſhall be upon his ſhoulder, and his

name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of Peace." And in the beginning of the next verſe, the extent of his dominion is ſpoken of. "And of the increaſe of his government and peace there ſhall be no end." There is a great number of like paſſages, which, in the courſe of this work, I ſhall have occaſion to introduce; but enough is already quoted, to ſhow for what this power was given to Chriſt, and that it is ſufficient to accompliſh the end intended. Again, it may be reaſonable to argue, that if the Almighty committed power into the hands of Chriſt, for the performance of any thing whatever, if there ſhould be found, at laſt, a want of power for the work intended, it would prove a want of wiſdom, in the giver of ſuch power. No one, who profeſſes to believe at all in Chriſt, will diſpute his power for the performance of all his will: But I wiſh to have the reader ſatisfied, in reſpect to this power, and in what it conſiſts, which, to make as clear as poſſible, I connect with my laſt particular in this general inquiry, which is

ATONEMENT IN ITS NATURE.

I have already obſerved, that atonement and reconciliation are the ſame. Reconciliation is a renewal of love, and love is the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, of which St. Paul ſpeaks, in Romans viii. 2, by which he was made free from the law of ſin. The ſoul, when governed by the law of ſin which is in the members, of which St. Paul ſpeaks, in Romans vii. 23, is in a ſtate of unreconciliation to the law of the Spirit. And it is by the force and power of the law of love, in Chriſt, that the ſoul is delivered from the government of

the law of ſin; the proceſs of this deliverance is the work of atonement, or reconciliation.

The reader will now ſee, with eaſe, that, that power which cauſes us to hate ſin, and love holineſs, is the power of Chriſt, whereby atonement is made. All the law and the prophets reſted on this ſpirit of love, by which alone they can be fulfilled. This eternal ſpirit of love is the *word*, or *logos*, which was, in the beginning, with God, and was God, which was hidden behind the letter of the law, and in the cabaliſtical allegories of the prophets, until it brake forth in the official character of Jeſus and rent the veil of the temple from top to bottom. Our Saviour, in his official character, is always called by the name, or names, which is, or are, applicable to God, manifeſt in the *fleſh*, which figuratively means the *letter* of the law; this circumſtance will fully account for all the ſcriptures which my opponent would urge, in ſupport of Jeſus' being eſſentially God.

Chriſt came not to deſtroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them; the law is as far fulfilled, in the ſoul, as it is brought to love God, in his adorable image, Jeſus; and a complete fulfilment of the law and the prophets, will effect love, in every ſoul, on whom the law, in a moral ſenſe, is binding.

Let it be aſked, by what means are we brought to love God? Anſwer, "We love him, becauſe he firſt loved us." God's love to us is antecedent to our love to him, which refutes the notion of God's receiving the atonement; but the idea, that the manifeſtation of God's love to us, cauſes us to love him, and brings us to a renewal of love, (in which ſpirit we all ſtood, in our ſpiritual head, Jeſus, before formation; and from which, we,

in a certain ſenſe elapſed, after being made ſubject to vanity) is perfectly conſonant to the neceſſity of atonement, it ſhows us what atonement is, and the power which the Mediator muſt have and exerciſe, in order to reconcile all things to God.

The method, by which we are brought to love any object, whatever, is, by ſeeing, or thinking, we ſee, ſome beauty in the object; and our love is always in proportion to the apparent good qualities of the object ſeen.

While our minds are darkened, by the veil on the heart, in reading of Moſes, ſo that the beauties of the miniſtration of life are hidden from our eyes, and its excellent glories are out of our ſight, it is impoſſible that we ſhould love Chriſt, or his word. Yet, during this darkneſs, we muſt love ſomething; therefore, as ſin and the vanities of elementary life preſent the greateſt beauty to our eyes, of any objects which we behold, our affections are placed on thoſe corruptible things.

Now I call up the queſtion again, has Jeſus power to cauſe us to love holineſs, and to hate ſin? Anſwer, yes, if he have power to reveal the divine beauties of the word, to remove the letter and its adminiſtration which are death, to take the veil from the heart, and to cauſe us to ſee himſelf altogether lovely.

When a ſinner views God as an enemy, and grumbles concerning his being hard and auſtere, when he feels an averſion to him, and wiſhes to avoid his preſence, it is certain the Son hath not revealed the Father to that ſoul. The ideas thus entertained of God are altogether wrong, and the mind that entertains them has no juſt conceptions of the Almighty. But bleſſed be the expreſs im-

age of the Invifible; he hath power to reveal the true character of the Father, to remove the veil from the heart, and to let the fun-beams of divine light gently into the underftanding; then God appears altogether lovely, and the chiefeft among ten thoufand, while the foul in ecftacy embraces the brightnefs of his glory, crying "My Lord, and my God." But the idea of the *letter* is fo fixed in the minds of chriftian people, in general, that the *veil* of the *law* is as fully on their minds, as it was on the Pharifees of old, which caufed them to be blind to their Meffiah when he came.

Chriftians have, for a long time, believed, that the *temporal death* of Chrift made an atonement for fin, and that the *literal blood* of the man who was crucified, has efficacy to cleanfe from guilt; but furely this is carnality, and carnal mindednefs, if I have any knowledge of the apoftle's meaning, where he fays, "To be carnally minded, is death." The *letter killeth*, but the *fpirit giveth life*. The apoftles were made able minifters of the new teftament, not of the *letter*, but of the *fpirit*. Chrift faith, "except ye *eat my flefh*, and *drink my blood*, ye have no *life* in you." Muft we underftand this in a *literal* fenfe? If we do, how fhall we underftand what he further fays of this matter? "The *flefh* profiteth nothing; the words which I fpeak, they are *fpirit* and they are life."

The apoftacy of the Jews happened, in confequence of the lips of the priefts not preferving knowledge; they fell from the *fpirit* of the law, were loft in the wildernefs of the letter, and therefore were blinded indeed. This was a figure of the more dreadful apoftacy of chriftians, as were various other circumftances recorded in the old

teſtament. The chriſtian apoſtacy happened, in the ſame way; and the church has been led into the wilderneſs of the letter, by an *hireling prieſthood*, who knew nothing of the *ſpirit* of the law; who have preached, in the name of the Lord, the *letter*, which *killeth*, in room of the *ſpirit*, which giveth *life*.

The *literal* death of the man, Chriſt Jeſus, is figurative; and all the life we obtain by it, is, by learning what it repreſented. The *literal body* of Jeſus repreſented the whole letter of the law, with all the allegories contained in the word of prophecy. The death of the body of Jeſus, repreſented the death and deſtruction of the letter, when the ſpirit comes forth, burſting the veil thereof, which is repreſented by the reſurrection of Jeſus from the dead. Agreeably to this, the reader will underſtand all the ſacrifices, under the law, by which the High Prieſts entered within the veil.

Being thus enabled to paſs from the *letter* to the ſpirit, we ſee what death it is, which is the proper ſacrifice for ſin, and what blood it is that cleanſes from guilt. The *blood* is ſaid to be the *life*, it is therefore the ſpirit or life of the law which does away ſin, and gives life to the ſoul.

I am ſenſible there are thouſands, who profeſs chriſtianity, who are blind enough to object and ſay, "Then the goſpel has nothing to do, in the ſalvation of mankind." But ſuffer me to ſay, the goſpel is nothing but the ſpirit of the law, which is the word, or logos, ſpoken in the law, brought forth from the ſhadows of the firſt diſpenſation. To believe in any other atonement, than the putting off of the *old man*, with his deeds, and the putting on of the new man, which, after God, is created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs, is carnal mindedneſs, and is death.

There is nothing in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, that can do away ſin, but love; and we have reaſon to be eternally thankful, that love is ſtronger than death; that many waters cannot quench it, nor the floods drown it; that it hath power to remove the moral maladies of mankind, and to make us free from the law of ſin and death, to reconcile us to God, and to waſh us pure, in the blood, or life, of the everlaſting covenant. O love, thou great Phyſician of ſouls, what a work haſt thou undertaken! All ſouls are thy patients; proſperous be thy labors, thou bruiſer of the head of carnal mind.

In this view of the ſubject, we may ſee how the divine grace of reconciliation may be communicated to thoſe who have never been privileged with the volume of divine revelation, and who have never heard the name of a Mediator proclaimed, as the only way of life and ſalvation. I have no doubt but thouſands, whoſe education has taught them to look on the chriſtian religion as an impoſture, may poſſeſs a good degree of this love, which is the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus; and though none can feel or experience this divine animation, only through the medium of the ſecond Adam, I do not conceive that its agency is confined particularly to names, ſects, denominations, people or kingdoms.

The *word*, which is nigh us, even in our hearts and mouths, is every where, operating, in ſome degree, in all hearts. The enmity, which God put between the ſeed of the ſerpent and the ſeed of the woman, is every where felt, and the two children are ſtruggling in every breaſt. When the creature-like nature, or the carnal mind, which is enmity againſt God, leads the whole man captive,

it is then that the ſoul is in a ſtate of unreconciliation and death; but when the heavenly child, which, after God, is created in righteouſneſs and true holineſs, binds the ſtrong man armed, and whiſpers heavenly invitations to the ſoul, revealing himſelf in the underſtanding, the ſoul immediately ceaſes to confer with fleſh and blood, beholds with inexpreſſible admiration the heavenly beauties of the new nature, is moulded into its likeneſs, and experimentally becomes a child of God; the flaming ſword is removed from the place of light; the way to the tree of life is opened, and the ſoul enters by the anchor of hope within the veil, where the cherubims are diſarmed of the flaming ſword, and ſtand looking down on the mercy ſeat, where God communes with his people. Thus, by the ſpirit of the word, the ſoul is brought to a ſweet communion with God, it feels its eternal ſonſhip, and rejoices therein, with joy unſpeakable and full of glory.

Perhaps the chriſtian reader will here pauſe, and ſay, my ſoul can witneſs, that, what the author writes, is true; but then, he does not tell of a regular *law work;* without which, the ſoul can never be brought to taſte thoſe delicacies in the goſpel proviſions. To this obſervation, I reply, I believe there are as egregious errors crept into the chriſtian church, in this particular, as in any thing relative to the chriſtian religion; and I further believe, that, among thoſe, who have really taſted, that the Lord is gracious, there are ſuch differences, on the above point, that, in many inſtances, they amount to a diſfellowſhip, and tend greatly to deſtroy the bleſſed work begun in the ſoul. But thoſe errors undoubtedly originate in ſome theories which are produced by the wiſdom of the

carnal mind, which is ſo oppoſed to the wiſdom from above, that it is always endeavoring to introduce ſomething that may ſerve to raiſe animoſities, and to ſow diſcord among brethren.

Some, who, by the force of a falſe education, have been led to believe, that God is an enemy to the ſinner, have ſuppoſed they were every day expoſed to the juſt vengeance of the Almighty, and have fancied that they could clearly ſee the juſtice of God, in their eternal baniſhment from heaven and happineſs; and they have been ſo wrecked, on this wheel of torture, as to be deprived of ſleep and every kind of repoſe, for a tedious time, ſome longer, and ſome ſhorter. Awful dreams, fraught with the moſt terrifying imaginations, have corroded the mind; and ſometimes, a burning lake of fire and brimſtone has been painted to the mind ſo clearly, that, for ſeveral days together, the poor frightened ſoul would feel as if it were on the brink of a precipice, expecting the next moment to be the fatal one. In this awful ſituation, it pleaſes God to manifeſt himſelf to the ſoul; and in a moment, all thoſe frightful imaginations are diſperſed, and an univerſal calm takes poſſeſſion of the whole region of the mind. The ſoul now rejoices, as a captive ſet at liberty, or a pardoned criminal; and there is nothing to be heard, from him, but the praiſes of his Benefactor. In this hour of joy, ſhould he hear ten thouſand ſinging praiſes to his Redeemer, he would not wiſh to ſtop them, to know whether they had all felt juſt as he had, before he knew the truth. But, in a ſhort time, carnal mind, ſtill alive in the members, begins to make its intruſions, and in a very deceitful way. It pretends to wiſh to help the ſoul along in religion, and ſays, there muſt be a cloſe

examination, it will not do to harbor errors, &c. But, in room of ſetting the creature to examine himſelf, it ſets him to examine his brother; his brother happens to be one, who, in fact, loves Chriſt and his word, and, to all appearance, walks in the path of obedience; but, he is one, whoſe education was not quite ſo perverſe as was his, and one who was taught, that God is an enemy to ſin, not to ſinners; that he will chaſtiſe, for iniquity, but that God is not ſo incenſed as ſome imagine. This brother cannot tell all that his interrogator has experienced, and is, therefore, rejected, for not telling a good *law work*.

It is now poſſible, that the reader is more ſurpriſed than before, and will ſay, the author does not talk like a chriſtian; and, feeling ſome diſagreeable emotion, he thinks he will read no further. But ſtop, dear ſir; that determination may ariſe wholly from a want of divine charity. If you are, in reality, a chriſtian, and ſtand in the liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made you free, what you here read will do you no harm.

I am now about to examine your *law work*, as you call it, and ſhall argue, that, what you call law, is only a creature of falſe education.

Before you found peace, you thought you could ſee the juſtice of God, in your eternal excluſion from heaven and happineſs. Now I aſk, can you find, that God ever gave a law to man which required endleſs miſery, in caſe of diſobedience? Sure I am, the ſcriptures ſpeak of none, neither do the dictates of good reaſon admit of its exiſtence. Perhaps my opponent may ſay, we are not to uſe our *reaſon* in matters of religion. I anſwer, if we are not to underſtand the things of God, by ſcripture and reaſon, I am at a loſs to know how to

come at them. I have before argued this point particularly, in order to ſhow, that ſuch a penalty does not exiſt in the law of God. Did you think, an excluſion from heaven and happineſs would be an excluſion from holineſs and righteouſneſs? Did you ever ſee the juſtice of God, in your being ſinful, unholy and impure? You anſwer, no. Then you never ſaw the juſtice of God, in your endleſs excluſion from heaven and happineſs.

A falſe education has rivcted the error in the minds of thouſands, that God's law required endleſs miſery to be inflicted on the ſinner. How often do profeſſed chriſtians addreſs the Almighty, and ſay, "Hadſt thou been *juſt* to have marked iniquity, we ſhould, long ſince, have been in the grave, with the dead, and in hell, with the damned." This addreſs amounts to nothing more, or leſs, than a complimental accuſation againſt God, for injuſtice! It ſurpriſes me, to think how profeſſed chriſtians will contend for the honor and glory of God, in a way that renders his character infinitely inglorious and diſhonorable.

Further, you believed, (you ſay) before you were a believer in the truth, that you ſtood in danger, every moment, of falling into endleſs miſery. I would aſk, if that were true, which you believed, before you believed the truth? I further aſk, are you now expoſed to thoſe dreadful torments? You will ſay, you hope for the better. And what is it that now preſerves you from ſuch danger? You confeſs it is your Saviour. But was it not he who preſerved you before your converſion? And are you more ſafe in his hands at one time than at another?

Some have gone ſo far, in their *law work*, as to ſay, they ſaw the juſtice of God ſo plainly, and it

appeared ſo beautiful, that they were perfectly willing to be endleſsly miſerable, according to its requirements. Such chriſtians will not allow, that a perſon can be ſavingly converted, without being firſt willing to be endleſsly miſerable. This, I muſt confeſs, is a law work as unreconcileable to ſcripture and reaſon, as it is corroſive to the mind. The amount of it is this, I ſee ſo much beauty and divine excellency, in the juſtice of God, that I am perfectly willing to exiſt, to all eternity, in rebellion againſt it! I wiſh to know, what the ſoul has to be thankful for, in the work of ſalvation? If it be brought to be willing to be endleſsly miſerable, it cannot be thankful for the gift of eternal life. Again, if a willingneſs to be damned, is a good ſituation, the ſoul ought to continue in it; and then, *hell* and *endleſs woe* would be as valuable a prize, for which to run, in the chriſtian race, as *heaven* and *immortality*.

It is generally believed, the Saviour ſtrives, by his Spirit, to bring the creature into a ſtate of grace and ſalvation; and that the devil ſtrives, with all his wily arts, to get the ſoul into hell and endleſs torments. Now, if theſe things be ſo, to which is the ſoul reconciled, when it is willing to be endleſsly miſerable? That multitudes have been in great fear of being rejected by the Almighty, at laſt, I have no doubt; for I confeſs thoſe torments have been mine, in no ſmall degree. But I contend, it is *impoſſible* for any one to be *willing* to be *endleſsly miſerable*. Happineſs always was, and always will be, the grand object of all rational beings; and to reverſe this object, would be to reverſe man from a reaſonable, to an unreaſonable creature.

The above notion of law work, has been the awful mean of driving multitudes of blinded mortals into as much despair, as the mind is capable of. Honest hearted persons, who do not wish to be deceived, or to deceive others, knowing that they never felt willing to be damned, and being told they must be willing, in order to be saved, have supposed, that God had already reprobated their fearful souls to endless ruin! Others have been so deceived, as to think they had better be willing to be *damned*, than not to be *saved*; desiring salvation so much, they think they had better be *willing* to be shut out of heaven forever, than to miss of salvation, and have, either honestly or hypocritically, said, they were willing to be damned; expecting great favors, in consequence of the confession. The moment we have a just idea of the spirit of the law making an atonement for sin, all those absurdities and contradictions are removed, and their causes taken away.

I doubt not but God communicates his grace to persons laboring under every kind of deception; and in respect to that grace, no dispute arises, among believers. Their disputes arise, from notions which they entertained before they were enlightened, or from certain inventions of their own, afterwards, which do not arise from the spirit of truth.

The divine efficacy of this atoning grace may be communicated to the most vile and profligate person in the world, and stop him in his full career of wickedness; it can show the sinner, in a moment, the deformity of sin, and the beauty of holiness. In other instances, the morally virtuous are led a long time in concern and great trouble, about

themſelves, before they find him of whom Moſes and the prophets did write.

God is not confined to character, time or place, to work the work of atonement in the ſoul; he does all things well, and in the beſt time and way; and chriſtians do very wrong, to contend about thoſe differences which ſin and deception cauſed in them, before they knew Chriſt.

Two perſons are diſcourſing about the agreeable flavor of the pine-apple; one ſays to the other, it taſtes very differently from what I expected it would before I taſted it; I thought it was a crabbed ſour. Says the other, I am ſure you never taſted of a pine-apple; for, before I taſted of one, I thought it was a diſagreeable bitter. Thus they diſpute, each in his turn arguing, that the other had never taſted of the fruit, becauſe they had different ideas about it, before they actually had any knowledge of it.

Would you not, kind reader, adviſe thoſe diſputants to come to a ſolution of their queſtion, in a different way? Surely you would; and if they could agree, about the real taſte of the apple, you would adviſe them to let their former falſe notions alone.

Then, chriſtian reader, go and do likewiſe, in the religion of Jeſus; and wherever you find a brother, who has, in reality, *taſted* that the Lord is gracious, fellowſhip him, as one initiated into the kingdom of God.

Atonement by Chriſt, was never intended to perform impoſſibilities; therefore, it was never deſigned to make men agree, and live in peace, while they are deſtitute of love one to another; but it is calculated and deſigned to inſpire the mind with that true love which will produce peace

in Jesus. As atonement is a complete fulfilment of the law of the heavenly man, it causes its recipient to love God and his fellow creatures, in as great a degree as he partakes of its nature. Ask one brought out of darkness into the marvellous light of the gospel, how God appears to him; and he will answer, more glorious than he can describe. Ask him, how he feels towards his fellow men; and he will say, even of his enemies, he wishes them no worse than to enjoy the blessings of divine favor. In times of refreshing, how many thousands have been heard to speak of the goodness of the Lord, and of the infinite fulness of his grace; and with what love, affection and fervency, have they invited their fellow men to the rich provisions of the gospel!

The earth, in time of drought, ceases to be fruitful; the streams and springs thereof are dried up; the fields put off their robes of green, and gardens afford no fragrant delights; but when the heavens give the wonted blessing in gentle showers, how suddenly is the face of nature changed! The purling rill murmurs through the mead, pastures and fields teem with vegetation, and gardens blush with enamelled beauties. So the soul, unwatered with the rain of righteousness, and destitute of the waters of eternal life, is like a barren fig-tree that yields no wholesome fruit. But behold the transition; the moment atoning grace is effective in the mind, the parched ground becomes a pool, and the thirsty land, streams of water. The soul is like the earth that drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom they are dressed; and, like a garden well watered and cultivated, yielding all manner of precious fruits.

Look on the trees, after autumn has plucked their leaves, and winter frozen their trunks and limbs: Without faith in ſpring, their future life would be hopeleſs; but wait for the ſeaſon of nature's appointment, when the increaſing majeſty of the ſunbeams gently removes the chains of froſt, and warm zephyrs are breathed on the ſurrounding ſnow, removing it from the land; the embryo bloſſom, nicely concealed in froſt, now ſwells with genial heat; and the leaf, ſo nicely folded in winter's cheſt, now diſplays its matchleſs green, and the whole foreſt rejoices in expanded delights. So, if we look on man, in the ſinful Adam, there is no appearance of heavenly life, or divine animation; the ſoul is bound in the fetters of ſin, frozen with covetouſneſs, and apparently dead in the winter of iniquity. But behold the Sun of righteouſneſs ariſing with healing in his wings, removing ſin, by the power of grace, and killing moral death, with divine life and animation, and cauſing the ſoul to rejoice in the kingdom of grace and glory. Then it may be rightly ſaid, "The winter is paſt, the rains are over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, and the time of ſinging is come." How myſterious are the ways of God! What infinite depths of wiſdom lie concealed from the ſight of mortals! He, who varies the ſeaſons of the year, and diverſifies nature through ſo great a number of changes, without loſing the ſmalleſt particle of matter, can carry his rational creatures through all the diſpenſations deſigned in infinite wiſdom, without loſing any, and conſummate the whole in glory at laſt.

Suffer me, kind reader, in my faithfulneſs with the ſaints, to excite a cloſe examination. It can be of no avail, to believe we are partakers of aton-

ing grace, unleſs that is really the caſe. I am of opinion, that many may be deceived in theſe things; ſome may ſuppoſe they are experimentally acquainted with them, when, in reality, they have no other evidence of it, than that ſome godly miniſter, as they ſuppoſe him to be, can fellowſhip them as chriſtians; while others do, in reality, feel this divine ſpirit of grace, in its atoning operations, but dare not ſuffer themſelves to believe it, becauſe they have not obtained the approbation of ſome, in whom they have been taught to put confidence.

I would, therefore, note ſome faithful evidences, in this caſe, which will not deceive us; and in doing this, I ſhall keep the reader cloſe to the ſpirit of the law, which is love to God and man. From theſe two points and their conſequences, all the evidence which can be obtained muſt be deduced. The queſtion then is, do you love God? If you anſwer yes, I aſk, why do you love him? and why do you endeavor to ſerve him? If you anſwer, becauſe it is your duty, and you fear his rod, if you do not; I tell you, you are deceived; you have no real love to your Maker. Undoubtedly you would ſay, (as many vain profeſſors have ſaid) "If you were certain of ſalvation in the world to come, you would do all the miſchief here you could." If the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt have any enemies in this wicked world, you are of that claſs. Your profeſſion of chriſtianity, for forty or fifty years; your attention to church ordinances, and the mighty parade you have made in a round of (what you call) religious duties, have only ſerved to paint you like a whited ſepulchre: You lack the one thing needful, which is *love*. You are ready to oppoſe all profeſſors of chriſtianity who do not

ſubſcribe to your articles of faith. The weapons of your warfare are a tongue of ſlander, and a ſpirit of perſecution; and you are daily raiſing falſe accuſations againſt thoſe who faithfully ſerve the Lord in ſpirit and in truth. The phariſees of old made as great profeſſions of religion as you do, and were as punctual to thoſe cuſtoms, whereby they made void the law, as you are to thoſe, whereby you make void the goſpel; and, like you, they were zealous of defending their religion; and in their zeal, they murdered the Lord of life and glory! Perhaps you will ſay, the author is hard, in his reproofs. I reply, if you, who anſwer the queſtions as I have ſtated, are not of the claſs of which I ſpeak, you will not feel the rebuke; but if you are, you not only deſerve it, but greatly need it. On the other hand, if you can truly ſay, you love the Lord, on account of the divine beauties and excellencies you behold in him; that he is in truth, to you, altogether lovely, and the chiefeſt among ten thouſand; that you delight in his ſervice, becauſe it is your meat and drink to do his will; that your greateſt enjoyment is obedience to his commands, which are joyous and not grievous, and *in keeping* of which, there is *great reward*; let your denomination be what it may, let you live in what part of the world you will, you are a friend to the religion of Jeſus, and you have ſweet communion with him who ſits at the right hand of God. Are you rich in the things of this world; you view all your poſſeſſions at the will, and you wiſh to have them at the diſpoſal, of the Maſter whom you ſerve; are you adorned with titles of human honor, how ſweet is it to lay all theſe things at the feet of him whom you eſteem infinitely honorable. Are you poor in the goods of fortune,

you poſſeſs the true riches; are you a diſconſolate widow, behold God is your huſband, and the father of your fatherleſs children.

Atoning grace produces all which the bible means by converſion, or being born of the Spirit; it brings the mind from under the power and conſtitution of the earthly Adam, to live by faith on the Son of God, and to be ruled and governed, even in this life, in a great meaſure, by the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus. It opens eternal things to our view and contemplation; it brings heaven into the ſoul, and clothes the man in his right mind; it inſpires the ſoul with divine meekneſs and boldneſs, at the ſame time. It was this that enabled the apoſtles of our Lord to preach the goſpel, in defiance of the rage of their enemies, and gave them immortal conſolations in their ſufferings for the cauſe of truth. It cauſes the chriſtian to love all God's rational creatures, and to wiſh their ſaving knowledge of the truth; it produces good works in their purity, and all the morality worth the name is founded on it. Its divine power is ſtronger than any poſſible oppoſition, and the gates of hell cannot prevail againſt it; it opens a door of everlaſting hope, and conducts the ſoul, by way of the croſs, to immortality and eternal life. This diſpenſation of atonement is manifeſted through Chriſt, for the reconciliation of all things to God, in his glorious kingdom of holineſs and happineſs.

In this general view of atonement, I come to my laſt inquiry propoſed in this treatiſe, viz.

The Conſequences of Atonement to Mankind.

In this laſt inquiry, I muſt be a little more lengthy, than in either of the former, but I hope

not too tedious. What I ſhall contend for, as the conſequences of atonement, is the *univerſal holineſs* and *happineſs* of mankind, in the final iſſue of the Redeemer's proceſs. In doing this, I will,

Firſt, Make a fair ſtatement of the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation, as I underſtand it.

Secondly, Take notice of the moſt frequent objections ſtated againſt the doctrine, by various denominations. And

Laſtly, Give my reaſons for believing in my general propoſition, from ſcripture and reaſon.

I will make the ſtatement of the doctrine which I believe, as ſhort as poſſible.

1ſt. God created man, in Chriſt the Mediator; in which creation, the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, of which St. Paul ſpeaks to the Romans, was the whole governing principle of his nature.

2d. After the creation of man in this divine conſtitution, it pleaſed the Almighty to reduce him to a ſtate of formation in fleſh and blood; in which conſtitution, the *law* of *ſin*, which St. Paul ſaid he found in his members, became the governing principle of the whole man.

3d. God has revealed his divine and glorious purpoſe of bringing man back from his *formed* ſtate, and from under the law of the earthly Adam, to his original *created* ſtate, forever to be under the governing power of the law of the heavenly conſtitution.

The objections, of which notice will be taken, ſtand oppoſed to my third propoſition: The firſt that I notice, is found in a propoſition frequently ſtated, by modern divines, thus, "God, in the great and infinite plan of moral government, conſults the greateſt poſſible good to the whole ſyſtem;

and in order for the greateſt poſſible happineſs to be produced, it was neceſſary, that ſome of God's rational creatures ſhould be eternally miſerable: Agreeable to which, all men cannot be ſaved." This is the only ground, on which an objection can be ſtated againſt univerſal holineſs and happineſs, while we admit the exiſtence of an Infinite Supreme.

I cannot go into an examination of any authorities, on which the above ſtatement is ſuppoſed to ſtand; for I know of none: All I can do, is to examine the ſtatement itſelf. It is argued, agreeably to this propoſition, that the infinite and inconceivable miſeries of the wicked, in the world to come, will enhance the happineſs of the glorified in heaven.

Againſt theſe ſtatements, I argue, if, in order for the greateſt poſſible happineſs to exiſt, the greateſt poſſible miſery muſt, alſo, exiſt, I wiſh to reverſe the ſubject: Then the propoſition would ſtand thus, in order for the greateſt poſſible *evil* to exiſt, the greateſt poſſible *good* muſt exiſt. Then, if God, in his univerſal plan, has produced as much *good* as was poſſible, he has alſo produced as much *evil* as poſſible, which renders the ſtatement, that he conſulted the greateſt poſſible *evil*, as juſt, as that he conſulted the greateſt poſſible *good*. Of courſe, there is no more propriety in calling him *good*, than there is in calling him *bad!*

If it be ſaid I carry this evil, or miſery, too far, even beyond my opponent's meaning, I will endeavor to ſhow him, according to his own ſtatement, that I do not. He ſays, *every degree* of miſery in hell, will produce *many degrees* of happineſs in heaven; if ſo, if the wretched be not made as miſerable as poſſible, the bleſſed cannot be made

as happy as poſſible; if they are not made as happy as poſſible, they muſt experience ſome want; and, of courſe, ſome miſery themſelves. On the other hand, if the wretched be not as miſerable as poſſible, they muſt have in poſſeſſion ſome remaining convenience: Then, neither the greateſt poſſible happineſs, nor the greateſt poſſible miſery, is produced.

Almighty God being put to the neceſſity of making ſome of his rational offspring eternally miſerable, in order to make the reſt forever happy, may be repreſented by a parent who has ten children; but only proviſions enough to preſerve the lives of five, until he could get more. In this awful delemma, he ſits down to conſult the *greateſt poſſible good;* ſays to himſelf, if I divide my proviſions equally among my children, all muſt ſurely ſtarve to death; but by neglecting five, I can ſave the lives of the other five, which he finally concludes to do. But I aſk the rational, I petition the reaſonable, I requeſt the impartial, to gueſs the *feelings* of a *father*, on ſuch an occaſion! Before him, are ten children, *all* in the image of himſelf; he ſees his own eyes roll in their heads, hears his own voice on their tongues, while his own blood frolics through their veins; how could he make the diviſion? how could he decide on one, for a victim? Would he not rather give his own *fleſh* to be their *meat*, and his own *blood* to be their *drink*, and fervently pray for plenty! But is the Almighty poor? Has he not enough and to ſpare? When the prodigal came home, did the father turn away his brother, ſo that he might have a plenty for him? Is there not fulneſs enough in God, to ſatisfy the wants of all his creatures? Why the neceſſity, then, of making ſome miſer-

able eternally? My opponent will ſay, the bleſſed are happified, in conſequence of the miſery of the wretched: But what reaſon can be given for ſuch an idea? How do we look on a perſon, in this world, who manifeſts joy and happineſs in the miſery of one of his fellow creatures? Do we ſay, he manifeſts a godlike diſpoſition? Surely no. From whence came charity; from heaven, or hell? If ſouls in heaven poſſeſs it, they cannot be happy, in conſequence of the miſery of any rational being; and ſhould the divine principle be found in hell, it would baniſh miſery, and annihilate the place!

Again, if a ſoul in heaven derive happineſs, from ſeeing, ſay one half, or two thirds, of the human race in miſery, would he not yet enjoy more, providing the whole, except himſelf, were in the ſame torment? If it be granted that he would, then, in order for a ſoul to be made as happy as poſſible, the whole human race, except that one, muſt be endleſsly as miſerable as poſſible! If it be argued, that it is not the number or multitudes of individuals who are made miſerable, that thus conſtitutes or enhances the happineſs of the bleſſed, but that it is the nature, juſtice and intenſeneſs of this miſery, which is neceſſary for the above purpoſe, it makes it very plain, that the eternal miſery of *one* would produce as much good, as of ten thouſand, or more.

We have now got ſo far, even on our opponent's ground, as to ſee, that there is no need of more than one ſoul's being endleſsly miſerable; and it ſtill further appears to me, that the miſery of *one* may be diſpenſed with, without departing from what my opponent has acknowledged; and that, by letting each individual of the human race, for

a moment, or any limited time, experience the nature of the miſery contended for; and then giving them a memory to retain it freſh in mind forever; this muſt of neceſſity produce the effect as well, and without the expence of a ſingle ſoul. I do not think it would abſolutely require omniſcient wiſdom to concert a better plan than the one I am oppoſing.

Suppoſe we alter the circumſtance of the father and his ten children: Suppoſe the father has proviſions enough for the whole, and his object, in the beſtowing of it upon them, is to cauſe the greateſt poſſible happineſs among his children. Which way would good ſenſe and parental affection chuſe, either to feed five to the full, and ſtarve the reſt to death, that their *dying groans* might give the others a *better appetite*, and *their food* a *good reliſh*, or to let them all be hungry enough to reliſh their food well, and all alike partake of it?

I will take notice of a certain paſſage of ſcripture, in this place, which ſome have endeavored to accommodate to the argument which I am diſputing; ſee Rev. xiv. 10, 11. "The ſame ſhall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he ſhall be tormented with fire and brimſtone in the preſence of the holy angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb: and the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up forever and ever: and they have no reſt day nor night, who worſhip the beaſt and his image, and whoſoever receiveth the mark of his name." It is not becauſe I am afraid of wounding this beaſt, or of affronting its rider, that I do not enter into a particular explanation of the paſſage recited; but becauſe it deſerves the labor of more time than I have now to

ſpare. However, the idea of my opponent is eaſily refuted; and this is as much as the reader ought to expect, in this work. The common idea is, that the puniſhment here ſpoken of is altogether in eternity, and not in this world of mortality; that it being in the preſence of the holy angels, and in the preſence of the Lamb, it indicates that it affords pleaſure in thoſe heavenly manſions where they dwell.

Firſt, I requeſt the reader to obſerve, that the verbs, *aſcendeth*, *have*, *worſhip*, and *receiveth*, are all in the ſame tenſe, which at leaſt favors the idea, that the ſulphurous ſmoke of this torment *aſcendeth* up, at the ſame time that the tormented *worſhip* the beaſt. If the apocalyptical beaſt be worſhipped to an endleſs eternity, it follows, that his worſhippers will be tormented as long. Until it is proved, that ſome will worſhip this beaſt, in another world, or endleſsly, it cannot be proved from this paſſage, that any will be tormented, in another world, or endleſsly. It is ſaid, in the text, that, the worſhippers of the beaſt have no reſt *day* nor *night*. If it can be proved, that *day* and *night* are reckoned in another world, or in eternity, my opponent has better ground for his argument than I think he has.

This beaſt, undoubtedly, is Antichriſt; the worſhippers of the beaſt are apoſtatized chriſtians of all denominations, ſince the chriſtian apoſtacy: They have always been in wars and commotions, and have had no reſt; and as for their being tormented, in all their public worſhip, with *fire* and *brimſtone*, no argument is neceſſary, to make it obvious.

Another objection, which has often been ſtated againſt the ſalvation of all men, ſtands in a pre-

tended axiom, viz. "A God *all mercy* is a God *unjuſt*." The force of this pretended axiom, as uſed againſt the ſalvation of all men, is, if God ſhould do juſtly, by all men, he would be an unmerciful being; or, if he ſhould ſhew mercy to all men, he would be an unjuſt being. There is nothing ſelf-evident in this axiom, that I can ſee, but its own want of propriety; it repreſents *juſtice* and *mercy* at an eternal *variance*. According to this *axiom*, and the argument deducible from it, juſtice may be compared to a monſtrous *wolf* in purſuit of a number of *lambs*, and *mercy* to a *ſhepherd* who is obliged to give up a large number of them, to gorge his omnivorous appetite, while he makes off with the reſt.

I have, already, ſufficiently refuted the idea of juſtice requiring the endleſs miſery of the creature; and, until that notion can be ſupported by ſcripture, or reaſon, an objection againſt the ſalvation of all men, cannot be ſtated, from the nature of juſtice. I have, alſo, ſhewed, that, in order for juſtice to require the *endleſs miſery* of any moral being, it muſt, of neceſſity, require the *endleſs continuance of ſin*; than which, nothing is more abſurd. Again, it is objected, as many are going out of this world daily, in a ſtate of ſinfulneſs and unreconciliation to God, and there being no alteration in the ſoul, for the better, after it leaves this natural life, millions muſt be miſerable, as long as God exiſts. The force of this objection ſtands on the ſuppoſition, that there is no alteration for the better, after death. Could this ſuppoſition be proved, I grant it would ſubſtantiate a formidable, and (I think) an unanſwerable objection againſt the final holineſs and happineſs of all men. I have often heard the objection made, but never heard

an evidence brought from ſcripture, or reaſon, to ſupport the declaration. Divines being ſenſible of the want of ſcripture, to ſupport this (their) ſuppoſition, have, very liberally, been at the expenſe of making ſome; and the notable paſſage which they have coined, and brought into very frequent uſe, is not to be found in the ſcriptures of the Old, or New Teſtament; but is frequently to be heard from the pulpit, read in many of their writings, and recited by many of their adherents. It is as follows: "*As the tree falls, ſo it lies; as death leaves us, ſo judgment will find us.*" I ſhall not contend about a different explanation of this addition to the ſcriptures, from the uſual one; but will only ſay, if the thing, which my opponents would prove by it, be true, viz. that ſouls cannot be altered for the better, after death, all our chriſtian people muſt remain eternally as unſanctified, as they are in this world of infirmities.

Again, many contend, that God deals with mankind as moral agents; that he ſets life and death before us, and leaves us to make our own choice, and to fare accordingly: That, as our eternal ſtate depends on what uſe we make of our agency, millions will prove rebellious, and, therefore, miſs of ſalvation. But I query, if one ſoul can obtain ſalvation, on the principle of moral agency, why another cannot, as well? If it be granted he can, I aſk, again, why all men cannot, as well as any? If it be ſtill granted, I ſay, as I have before ſaid, that which can be done may be done; therefore, the objection fails. But the objector will ſay, it renders univerſal ſalvation uncertain; I anſwer, no more than it renders univerſal damnation certain: All may be loſt forever, as well as one; therefore, my opponent's

hopes are ſubject to the ſame ſhipwreck, to which he would expoſe mine. I would further inquire, if God deal with man upon a ſyſtem of moral agency, is it God's revealed will, that all m n ſhould be ſaved, agreeably to their agency? If it be granted that it is, I further inquire, whether God's will, in the moral agency of man, will be eternally fruſtrated? If not, no objection ſtands againſt univerſaliſm; but the propoſition, on which my opponent endeavors to ſubſtantiate an objection, favors the doctrine, as far as it goes.

In my obſervations on the *liberty* of *will*, I have given ſome of my ideas concerning agency, as it is generally underſtood; but moral agency may be very differently underſtood, by different perſons. If, by moral agency, be meant an ability to love an object, or objects, which appear agreeable, I have no objections to make; but if it mean an ability to hate that which appears agreeable and to love that which appears diſagreeable, I contend, no ſuch agency exiſts, in any being within the compaſs of our knowledge. It is certainly reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that all the agency poſſeſſed by man, was given him by his Maker; and that, when God gave him this agency, it was for a certain purpoſe, which purpoſe muſt, finally, be every way anſwered, providing God be infinitely wiſe. I cannot but think it incorrect, to ſuppoſe, that God ever gave any creature agency to perform what he never intended ſhould be done. Then, if any ſoul be made endleſsly miſerable, by its agency, it follows, that God gave that ſoul this agency for that unhappy purpoſe; and if any be ſaved, by their agency, God gave them their agency, for that bleſſed end. If any wiſh to make a different uſe of agency, let them ſtate fairly, that

God gave man an agency, intending man's eternal ſalvation thereby; but man makes a different uſe of his agency, from what God intended, whereby the gracious deſigns of Deity are forever loſt!

If my opponent will not fix his agency on ſome of the above noted principles as it reſpects the iſſue of the argument, I am ſure he can do nothing with it to any effect. If agency be ſtated on the principle of God's intending the creature's ſalvation, by it, and it be granted, that his will, in the affair, will be done, it is an acknowledgment of the doctrine for which I contend. But if it be ſtated, that, although God gave man his agency, for the glorious purpoſe of his endleſs felicity, yet his purpoſe may fail; could this ſtatement be proved true, it would not only refute univerſal ſalvation, but every thing elſe, as being a divine ſyſtem, on which we may, with any confidence, depend.

One of the objections, on which the enemies of univerſal holineſs and happineſs put much dependance, and which they frequently urge againſt the doctrine, is ſtated from the force of *unlimited words*, as they find a few of them in ſcripture applied to the miſery of the wicked. The force of this objection, I remove, by proving, that unlimited words are applied to things and events which are not ſtrictly eternal or endleſs; and ſurely, the candid reader will acknowledge this way of reaſoning is juſt, and by no means evaſive. I ſhall not labor this point largely, for it has been done faithfully by an able author, whoſe works are among us. I will only introduce a few ſcriptures, and make ſome obſervations on them, for the benefit of thoſe of my readers who have not ſeen the maſterly work referred to. See Gen. xvii. 7, 8.

"And I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations, for an *everlaſting* covenant; to be a God unto thee, and thy ſeed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, the land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the land of Canaan for an *everlaſting* poſſeſſion; and I will be their God." Verſe 13. "He that is born in thy houſe, and he that is bought with thy money, muſt needs be circumciſed; and my covenant ſhall be in your fleſh, for an *everlaſting* covenant." In the above paſſage, the land of Canaan is called an *everlaſting* poſſeſſion. Will my opponent contend the word *everlaſting*, here means an endleſs duration? Will he contend, that Abraham now poſſeſſes the land wherein he was then a ſtranger, or that his ſeed do, or will, poſſeſs that land as long as God exiſts? If not, then the objection is given up.

Again, the covenant of *circumciſion of the fleſh* is called an *everlaſting* covenant. Will the objector contend, that the covenant of circumciſion in the *fleſh* is now in force, and that it will remain in force as long as God exiſts? It is evident, from ſcripture, that theſe ordinances and this covenant are removed, and ſucceeded by a *covenant* which is called a *better* one; ſee Heb. viii. 6, 7, 8. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent miniſtry, by how much alſo he is the Mediator of a *better covenant*, which was eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes. For if that firſt covenant had been faultleſs, then ſhould no place have been ſought for the ſecond. For finding fault with them, he ſaith, behold, the days come, ſaith the Lord, when I will make a *new covenant* with the houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of Judah." Chap. ix. 10, the apoſ-

tle argues, that the ordinances of the firſt covenant were impoſed on the people until the time of reformation. Gen. xlviii. 3, 4. "And Jacob ſaid unto Joſeph, God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and bleſſed me; and ſaid unto me, behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy ſeed after thee, for an *everlaſting* poſſeſſion." And he further ſaid, in the bleſſing of Joſeph, "The bleſſings of thy father have prevailed above the bleſſings of my progenitors unto the utmoſt bounds of the *everlaſting* hills." Exod. xl. 15. "And thou ſhalt anoint them (Aaron's ſons) as thou anointed their father, that they may miniſter unto me in the prieſt's office; for their anointing ſhall *ſurely* be an *everlaſting* prieſthood throughout their generations." Lev. xvi. 34. "And this ſhall be an *everlaſting* ſtatute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Iſrael, for all their ſins once a year; and he did as the Lord commanded Moſes." The reader may learn the aboliſhment of the prieſthood that is here called an *everlaſting* prieſthood, from Heb. vii. 11, 12. "If, therefore, perfection were by the Levitical prieſthood, (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another prieſt ſhould riſe after the order of Melchiſedec and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the prieſthood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a change alſo of the law." Jonah ii. 6. "I went down to the bottom of the mountain; the earth with her bars was about me *forever:* yet haſt thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God." Many more paſſages might be quoted, to clear this point of argument, if more were neceſ-

ſary; but depending ſome, as I ought to, on the candor of my reader, I forbear to be tedious.

In the next place, I will take notice of a number of ſcriptures in connexion, all of which have been erroneouſly applied to the future and endleſs miſery of mankind. See Mal. iv. 1. "For behold, the day cometh that ſhall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, ſhall be ſtubble, and the day that cometh ſhall burn them up, ſaith the Lord of hoſts, that it ſhall leave them neither root nor branch." Matt. iii. 10. "And now alſo, the ax is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and caſt into the fire." Verſe 12. "Whoſe fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire." Chap. v. 29, 30. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and caſt it from thee; for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy members ſhould periſh, and not that thy whole body ſhould be caſt into hell." Chap. vii. 13, 14. "Enter in at the ſtraight gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to deſtruction, and many there be that go in thereat; becauſe ſtraight is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadēth unto life, and few there be that find it." Chap. xiii. 30. "Let both grow together until the time of harveſt; and in the time of harveſt, I will ſay unto the reapers, gather ye together, firſt the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." The whole of the 25th, which is too lengthy to be written at large. The laſt paragraph of Luke xvi. Theſſ. i. 7, 8, 9, "And to you who are troubled, reſt with us; when the

Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming *fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; who ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." There are a number more ſcriptures of the like nature of the above quoted, to which I ſhould be glad to attend, were it not for ſwelling this work too large. I will, however, after I have anſwered theſe in their order, take into conſideration ſome others of a different kind. Thoſe which I have quoted, moſtly reſpect that diſpenſation which is repreſented by fire, which to illuſtrate more eaſily to the reader's underſtanding, I will firſt produce a paſſage from St. Paul's 1ſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians iii. 15, which I will call my *key* text. "If any man's works ſhall be burnt, he ſhall ſuffer loſs, but he himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire." By my *key*, I learn, that the fire which cauſes the wicked to *ſuffer*, has the power of *ſalvation* even for the ſufferers. So in all the paſſages recited, where *fire* is mentioned, it is evident the ſame fire is intended. "For behold, the day cometh that ſhall burn as an oven." In this ſame chapter, this day is called the great and dreadful day of the *Lord*, who promiſed to ſend Elijah the prophet before that day come, whoſe buſineſs ſhould be to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, leſt the Lord ſhould ſmite the earth with a curſe.

I inquire, firſt, concerning the coming of this prophet, in order to fix on a time for the commencement of this day of the Lord. That Elijah and Elias are the ſame, in ſcripture, no doubt will be

entertained. Then turn to Mat. xvii. 12, 13. "But I ſay unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatſoever they liſted; likewiſe, ſhall alſo the Son of man ſuffer of them. Then the diſciples underſtood that he ſpake unto them of John the baptiſt." By this ſcripture, it appears, that the promiſe of the coming of Elijah the prophet, was fulfilled by the coming of John the baptiſt, who came in the ſpirit and power of Elias; which ſhows very clearly, that the goſpel day, or coming of Meſſiah, was the day that ſhould *burn* as an *oven*. The burning of an oven, is uſed here as a metaphor to repreſent the power of goſpel light and love in the moral ſyſtem. In the chapter preceding our text, Chriſt is prophecied of, as follows; ſee verſe 1, and ſo on. Obſerve the fore runner is firſt ſpoken of, and then Chriſt himſelf. "Behold I will ſend my meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the way before me;" thus far, John the baptiſt is intended. "And the Lord whom ye ſeek ſhall ſuddenly come to his temple, even the meſſenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he ſhall come, ſaith the Lord of hoſts. But who may abide the day of his coming, and who ſhall ſtand when he appeareth? for he is like a *refiner's fire* and like a fuller's ſoap. And he ſhall ſit as a refiner and purifier of ſilver; and he ſhall purify the ſons of Levi and purge them as gold and ſilver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteouſneſs." The purpoſe intended by the fire of this day of the Lord is made very evident, by the above quotation, which, with my *key*, will much aſſiſt us in underſtanding the metaphor before us. Firſt, how does an oven burn? Anſwer, ſo as to conſume the combuſtibles which are in it, by

which the oven is prepared for the maſter's uſe, being perfectly cleanſed, and of a right temperature to receive whatever the baker pleaſes to put into it. By this fire, the ſons of Levi were to be cleanſed, ſo as to offer an offering in righteouſneſs; and by this fire, the hay, wood and ſtubble, are burned; but the poſſeſſor of them, though he *ſuffer loſs*, yet is ſaved by it. Here we ſee, in room of the ſinner's endleſs miſery, his purification as a prerequiſition for endleſs bliſs and happineſs. My opponent may urge, that the text ſays, the proud, and all that do wickedly, ſhall be ſtubble, and the day that cometh ſhall burn them up, ſaith the Lord of hoſts, that it ſhall leave them neither root nor branch; which hath reſpect to the *ſinner*, and not to his *ſins*. Be it ſo: But will the paſſage afford my opponent's inference, which is the endleſs duration of the ſinner's miſery? By no means; for that which is burnt up, *root* and *branch*, does no longer abide. To ſay, of a tree, that it was burnt up, *root* and *branch*, would forbid the idea of its *enduring* the *fire always*. The total *annihilation* of the wicked, is a thouſand times more literally proved, than his endleſs miſery: and I may add, with propriety, that, the very words which my opponent urges in ſupport of endleſs miſery, are ſufficient proof againſt it. I argue, that this particular part of the text alludes to the total deſtruction of the ſinner, in reſpect to the nature of the earthly Adam; of which, neither *root* nor *branch* will be left. This I conceive to be in reality what the text means; and I am perfectly willing to reſt the correctneſs of my ideas on the experience of any vital lover of the religion of Chriſt. Call to mind, what a *crackling* of *thorns*, what a *breaking up* of the *nether parts* of thy *ſoul*, what a *conſump-*

tion ſeized every part, and what a *ſinking* to *nothing*, when the *word* of *God*, the *ſpirit* of the *law*, which is *ſharper* than any two edged ſword, *pierced* to the *dividing* of thy *ſoul* and *ſpirit*, *joints* and *marrow*, and *plainly diſcerned* the *thoughts* and *intents* of thy *heart*, until thou found thyſelf on the rock of ages. By this method of underſtanding the ſcriptures, we underſtand them experimentally.

Further, obſerve what is ſaid to thoſe who fear the Lord, in the chapter where our text lies, "But unto you who fear my name ſhall the Sun of righteouſneſs ariſe, with healing in his wings, and ye ſhall go forth and grow up as calves of the ſtall, and ye ſhall tread down the wicked, for they ſhall be aſhes under the ſoles of your feet." Who are they, who truly fear the name of the Lord? Thoſe, and thoſe only, who have paſſed the *fire*, as above deſcribed; they receive healing from the Sun of righteouſneſs, even from his *wings*, which are the *types* and *allegories* of the law, by which, the *word*, or *logos*, is brought to our underſtandings. Such grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. But who are the wicked, which they are to tread down as aſhes under their feet? Their neighbors? Yes, according to the conduct of apoſtatized chriſtians who deſpiſe and perſecute all who differ from their ſuperſtitions: But, according to truth, the wicked are their bodily, or creaturely natures and appetites However hard it may ſeem to the reader, I ſay, the real chriſtain lives above himſelf, and views his carnal appetites contemptible as aſhes.

We paſs to Matthew iii. 10. "And now alſo, the ax is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and caſt into the fire." In

order to ſee that the fire into which the trees are caſt, when hewn down, is the ſame as that of which we have already ſpoken, obſerve verſe 11. "I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whoſe ſhoes I am not able to bear, he ſhall baptize you with the *Holy Ghoſt* and with *fire*." By this, we underſtand, that the fire, in our text, is that which accompanies the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and is that fire with which Chriſt baptizes. Verſe 12. "Whoſe fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with *unquenchable fire*." *Fire* is mentioned, in each of the three verſes quoted, and its uſe is plainly ſhown, which is to *burn* the *trees* which bring not forth good fruit, to *accompany* the *Holy Ghoſt* in *baptiſm*, and to *conſume* the *chaff* when the wheat is gathered into the garner.

Now let us look for the doctrine of endleſs miſery, and ſee if it can be proved by the text under conſideration. I will agree, that the *trees*, which do not bring forth *good fruit*, are wicked men; and my oppoſers muſt acknowledge, that they, and all the reſt of mankind, are of that deſcription, as it is written, "there is none that doeth good, no not one." And who will pretend the phariſees, to whom John ſpake, whom he calls a generation of vipers, were not wicked? And if caſting the trees into the fire, mean caſting ſinners into remedileſs woe, I aſk, if the baptiſm of the *Holy Ghoſt* and of *fire* mean the ſame thing? None will allow it; but all believe it to be ſalutary to all thoſe who experience it. The reader will then obſerve, John told this generation of *vipers*, that he, who ſhould come after him ſhould *baptize them* with the *Holy*

Ghoſt, and with *fire*. How could thoſe phariſees be made endleſsly miſerable, and yet be ſaved by the power of the Holy Ghoſt? If we examine the burning of the chaff, we ſhall find it to be by the ſame fire, and the conſequences the ſame.

The reader may deſire ſome more explanation of theſe paſſages; then learn, firſt, the *ax*, which is laid at the *root* of the *trees*, is the *executive power* of the *law*; the root, that Adamic nature, in which we all ſtand naturally; the trees, every individual of mankind; being hewn down, is being ſlain by the law; being caſt into the *fire*, is being refined by the ſpirit of the law, whereby the ſoul is prepared for the kingdom of holineſs and happineſs. All this muſt be done for the beſt of characters in the earthly nature. In the ſimilitude of the wheat and chaff, we have a very natural repreſentation of man in two ſtates; for as man, in his natural ſtate, is encompaſſed with the imperfections of the earthly Adam, ſo he is repreſented by wheat, which, when growing in the field, is encompaſſed with chaff, which continues to confine it, until it comes to maturity, and a proceſs is introduced which makes the ſeparation. Here let me make ſome further uſe of the ſimilitude than juſt to anſwer my point of argument. Wheat, though concealed from vulgar eyes, by chaff, yet, by the experienced, in the raiſing of grain, is perfectly well known; and we do not condemn wheat and throw it away, becauſe nature has ſo ordered, that it is encompaſſed with chaff while growing in the field. So man is not to be valued the leſs by the wiſdom of God, on account of the imperfections of his earthly nature. And we may, with great propriety, argue, that, as chaff is neceſſary for the growth of wheat, until it comes to maturity; ſo

are all the imperfections of man, viewed by divine wifdom, until the creature comes to that experience, which was intended in a ftate of imperfection. As the procefs, that feparates wheat from chaff, would difappoint the expectation of the hufbandman, were it applied prematurely; fo the *gofpel*, by which men are prepared for the kingdom of God, muft do its office in due time, or in the fulnefs of time. The ftate in which man is, prior to the knowledge of God and his heirfhip in him, is reprefented by wheat connected with chaff; and the ftate, unto which he is finally brought, by divine mercy, is reprefented by a *garner* which receives the wheat when it is feparated from chaff. The unquenchable fire which confumes the chaff, is a fignificant figure of the power of gofpel grace to remove all *excrefcences* from our *hearts* and *confciences*, and to prepare us for the kingdom of immortal purity. What, but the *nature* of *God*, can be juftly called *unquenchable fire?* If any other principle in the univerfe can juftly bear that appellation, it muft be *equal*, if not *fuperior*, to *God himfelf*. An apoftle fays, "our *God* is a *confuming fire;*" and I muft confider it erroneous, to believe, that this *fire* is *quenchable*, or that there is more *unquenchable fires* than *one*. This *fire* of eternal *truth* will, undoubtedly, deftroy every thing which is in oppofition to its nature; but has no power to deftroy its own nature or its offfpring. Now, if after thefe obfervations, the candid reader can fee the eternal mifery of mankind proved from the fcriptures under confideration, all I have to add, is, that he can fee more than I can.

We come next to that paffage, made much ufe of, againft univerfal holinefs and happinefs, found in Matthew v. 29, 30. The force of my oppo-

nent's argument rests on being "cast into *hell*," connected with the like passage in St. Mark ix. where the subject is exposed to be cast into the *fire* that *never* shall be *quenched*.

Let us first inquire what constitutes *hell*. The word, *hell*, undoubtedly, has different meanings in scripture, sometimes signifying the *grave*, and sometimes a state of great trouble of mind, in consequence of conscientious guilt. The hell, noted in our text, is of the latter signification, as no one will dispute; but my query is, what constitutes this hell. I conceive it to be produced by the conjunction of contrary principles in the mind. All the vile appetites of man, were they gratified, without the least restraint, could never produce this *hell*, without the reflections of divine truth, in the understanding. Though the body might be debilitated by it, and impregnated with corrosive disorders, yet no disturbance is felt in the mind, until a divine principle wakes up, like a light shining in a dark place. As when a traveller enters a dark cave for rest, though poisonous serpents abide there, yet he may be undisturbed, until the sun rises and discovers to him, by what he had been entertained! He is shocked, his blood runs cold, and he is in distress, until he makes his escape. It is evident, that this traveller's trouble was produced by two circumstances; first, the serpents being there; and secondly, the light's giving him the knowledge of it. This glorious light of heaven is not to be accused, for having tormented the traveller; and yet, had it not been for that, he might have felt no disturbance. So it is with man; he might enter into all the vile abominations of a carnal mind; he might indulge his fleshly appetite in every sensual pleasure; he

might indulge his feet in every by-path, his eyes in every fleshly lust, and his hands in blood, and feel no remorse, were it not for this fire, which all the *floods* of *corruption* can never *quench*.

The next question, to which I wish to call the attention of the reader, is, whether the salvation of the sinner do not entirely depend on the force, power and unchangeable nature of this divine fire, which opens his eyes to see the poisonous nature of carnal pleasures and earthly mindedness? Could all the black waters of the carnal or old man, in the least degree, quench the heat of this fire, I own the sinner is lost forever; but his salvation is hoped for, if the fire be never quenched. Here, again, the reader will observe, that, on the very expression, upon which my opponent builds his argument, I rest mine; shewing its propriety, by applying my key text, "If any man's work be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The man, possessed of hay, wood and stubble, would not suffer the loss of them, were it not for that fire, by which the day of the Lord is revealed; neither could he be saved, with a gospel salvation, did not this fire consume those vile combustibles.

My opponent may urge his argument, on another expression, in connexion with this scripture, viz. "Where the worm dieth not." Should we be ever so critical, in investigating these words, they would be found to favor the idea for which I contend. If, by the *worm*, be meant the *wicked*, which I am willing to grant, and which I know my opposer will contend for, what I need to add, is, that, all it proves, is, this *fire* is not *death* to the *sinner*. All the *moral death*, to which men are exposed, is *carnal mindedness*; and all the moral life,

of which they can be poſſeſſed, is contained in that ſpirit of divine animation, which, in the ſcripture under conſideration, is repreſented by *fire*, that never can be quenched. I am as fully perſuaded, of this truth, as I am of any idea in all my ſtudy; and I believe my reader will be of my opinion, if he will obſerve what Chriſt has further ſaid concerning it, in the converſation where the text lies; ſee Mark ix. 49, 50. "For every one ſhall be ſalted with *fire*, and every ſacrifice ſhall be ſalted with ſalt. Salt is good; but if the ſalt have loſt its ſaltneſs, wherewith will you ſeaſon it? Have *ſalt* in yourſelves, and have peace one with another." All who obſerve attentively, will eaſily ſee, that the *fire*, with which every one is to be ſalted, is the ſame that never ſhall be quenched, and is that ſalt which Chriſt exhorts us to have in ourſelves, which is productive of peace. The reader will eaſily ſee the impropriety of ſuppoſing ſuch ſcriptures indicative of the endleſs miſery of mankind; and the propriety of underſtanding them conſonant with my key text, ſignifying the deſtruction of ſin, and the ſalvation of the ſinner.

We next take notice of Matthew vii. 13, 14. The argument againſt me, is reſted on theſe expreſſions, viz. "And many there be which go in thereat," "And few there be that find it." In order to detect this argument, as laconically as poſſible, I firſt aſk, do the words *few* and *many* mean the ſame number, when applied to the ſame ſubject of inquiry? I preſume, all will anſwer, no. I then aſk, is it proper, or juſt, to ſay, the word, *many*, in Iſaiah liii. 11. where it is written, "By his knowledge, ſhall my righteous ſervant juſtify *many*, for he ſhall bear their iniquities," means the ſame number, as the word, *few*, in the text under

conſideration? Again, Rev. vii. After an account is given of the hundred and forty and four thouſand, it is ſaid, verſe 9. "After this, I beheld, and lo, a *great multitude*, which no man could number, of *all nations*, and *kindreds*, and *people*, and *tongues*, ſtood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Will any one doubt the ſalvation of the *many*, ſpoken of by Iſaiah, or the great multitude, quoted from Revelation? If they do not, they can, with no propriety, contend, that the *few*, ſpoken of by Chriſt, in the paſſage under examination, are all that will finally obtain ſalvation by him.

Let us now take notice of the text, in its true ſenſe. The way of life is, now, what it always was, and always will be, which is Chriſt, the heavenly man; and the way to deſtruction is what it always was, and always will be, which is the earthly Adam, or carnal or old man. Chriſt ſpake, in the then preſent tenſe, ſhowing that the multitude were all travelling in earthly mindedneſs, which is death; and that thoſe, who had truly found him, of whom Moſes and the prophets did write, who walked in the Spirit, and not in the fleſh, were but *few*.

My opponent, ſeeing his objection, which reſted on the words *few* and *many*, anſwered, and the text rationally explained, aſide from his idea, will wiſh to infer an argument, from what I have acknowledged, to oppoſe me. He will ſay, if the multitude, under the law, were not acquainted with the goſpel, they muſt be forever loſt from *holineſs* and *happineſs*, as they died in that ſtate of ignorance. I have already attended to this objection, but wiſh to write a few words more on the ſubject. The

ſuppoſition, that the ſoul cannot be altered for the better, after the death of the body, will confound the ideas of many who believe it. You aſk one, who believes there is no alteration after death, whether he believe the ſaint to be as perfect while he lives in this world, as he will be hereafter? And he will ſay, no. Aſk him if he expect to be perfectly fitted for heaven and eternal glory, while he inhabits this vile body, and he will anſwer, no; and yet, he holds there is no alteration after death. Why the idea has become ſo general, that ſouls cannot be enlightened, and converted from ſin to holineſs, after the death of the body, is difficult for me to determine. If the ſoul continue a rational being, cannot the All-wiſe communicate knowledge to it *out* of the natural body, as well as he can *in* it? If the ſoul, after death, have a moral exiſtence, it muſt be a ſubject of moral principles, and ſtand accountable to a moral law adapted to his moral capacity; and it muſt be as much the duty of ſouls, hereafter, to yield obedience to God, as it is while they are in the body; and to preclude the poſſibility of ſuch obedience, would be a diſhonor to ſuch a law. To deny the exiſtence of thoſe moral principles, in the world to come, is denying the exiſtence of rational happineſs, or puniſhment. My opponent will ſay, if God have revealed to us, in the ſcriptures of truth, that he will not afford any privilege after death, to thoſe who do not become true converts to Chriſt, in this world, we have no right to ſay to the reverſe, however much our reaſon may be put to confuſion, I anſwer, that may be granted, without injury to my argument, as no ſuch revelation has been made; when it is, it will be early enough to believe it.

The parable of the tares of the field, comes next under conſideration. This paſſage needs not be quoted at large, as the reader has it perfectly in his mind. In order to do this ſubject juſtice, I will endeavor to ſtate the objection on the ground, upon which I believe my opponent would chuſe to reſt it; which is, the *tares* mean *wicked men* and *women* who are impenitent; and as the tares are to be burnt, it ſignifies the awful ſtate into which God will caſt the wicked, in the world to come. For the ſake of argument, I will grant, for a moment, what the objector ſtates, and further inquire, if the righteous, or believers in Chriſt, are repreſented by wheat, and the wicked by *tares*, what is meant by the *field*, in which theſe two kinds of ſeed are ſown? It will not anſwer any one's mind, to ſay, that the field is the ſame as the ſeed ſown; then, what is it? Says my opponent, it is the earth, on which the righteous and the wicked live; be it ſo; then let us ſeek the conſequences. Of the tares, it is ſaid, he, that ſowed them is the devil. According to this mode of reaſoning, God has produced ſome of the inhabitants of the earth, and the devil ſome; and all the wrong there is, in the affair, is a matter of treſpaſs. The devil has ſown ground that did not belong to him, as it appears, by the text, that the field belonged to him who ſowed the good ſeed; and that he who ſowed the tares occupied ground that did not belong to him. I do not ſee why the devil could not have created an earth, as eaſily as to create men and women; and then, he might have occupied his own territory unmoleſted! I do not wish to take too much advantage of an error, but I wish to make this matter ſo plain, that no reader may fail of ſeeing the

merits of the query. I will, therefore, inquire, further, what conſtitutes thoſe wicked, whom the devil placed on this earth? Have they ever deſerted the ſervice of Satan; and, rebelling againſt their maker, ſinfully yielded obedience to God? If they have faithfully ſerved their creator, I can ſee no ſinfulneſs in them, and it would be bad argument, to ſay, that God would ſubject beings to his government whom he did not make. The thoughts of ſuch conſequences wean the objector's mind from the premiſes which afford them, and other anſwers to the queſtion propoſed muſt be ſought for. What is meant by wheat? what, by tares? and what, by field, in which the wheat and tares were ſown? I think the anſwers muſt be as follow: The *wheat* means the ſame as is meant by *ſeed* ſpoken of in a former parable, the explanation of which introduces the one under examination. In the parable of the ſower, it is plain, that Chriſt meant the goſpel, or the doctrine of truth, by *ſeed* which he ſowed; and by the various kinds of ſoil into which the ſeed fell, is meant the various circumſtances, in a moral ſenſe, of thoſe to whom he preached the word of the kingdom. The truth then is plain; by wheat, is meant the true doctrine of Chriſt; the tares mean falſe doctrines which would be introduced by Antichriſt; and the field is mankind, or the church. Chriſt undoubtedly meant to repreſent the chriſtian apoſtacy, in this parable; in which ſtate of the church, we find truth and error mixed, the goſpel of life, and the doctrine of endleſs damnation, like wheat and tares in the ſame field. Chriſtians have framed to themſelves doctrinal creeds and modes of faith, and called them orthodox; they have bowed down to their images, and ſaid,

Theſe are the gods which brought us up out of the land of Egypt; they have endeavored, by fire and ſword, to deſtroy hereſy, in which they have been as unſkilful as Chriſt repreſented in the parable; they were as likely to root up the wheat as the tares. But when theſe doctrines have brought forth their fruits, and it ſhall appear evident to all, that evil conſequences have always attended thoſe creeds formed by men, it will be eaſy for thoſe who are wiſe in the goſpel, to gather thoſe tares, and *burn* them with that fire which conſumes the hay, wood and ſtubble; and to gather the true doctrine of goſpel promiſes into the garner, or church of Chriſt, no more to be mixed with tares, or falſehood.

What a pity it is, ſpeaking in reference to partial good and evil, that profeſſed miniſters of Chriſt ſhould ſo vehemently contend for the truth of doctrines which they themſelves acknowledge no being wiſhes true, but the devil and his ſubordinate wicked ſpirits. It is the general topic of the day, in this enlightened land, contended for in almoſt every pulpit, that ſome of God's rational dependant creatures muſt, of *neceſſity*, ſuffer in endleſs torments, with devils, to blaſpheme God forever, and never ceaſe from ſin, which, they, who believe and preach it, wiſh and daily pray, might be falſe. If falſe doctrines were intended, by tares, in this parable, and thoſe tares are to be deſtroyed, the conſequence muſt be ſalutary to mankind, for they will then know the truth, and the truth will make them free.

My opponent may urge that his ideas of the parable of the tares are moſt conſonant to the explanation which Chriſt gave it, as it is there ſaid, the tares are the *children of the wicked one*, *&c.* I do not wiſh to explain Chriſt's explanation; but I be-

lieve the reader of the prefent day, would be as likely to mifunderftand the explanation as the parable itfelf. I know Chrift faid, the *good feed* are the *children* of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one. But I do not conceive, that, by *children* of the *kingdom*, in this parable, is meant the fame as is meant by the fame expreffions in fome other paffages; inftance one, fee Matthew viii. 12. "But the *children* of the *kingdom* fhall be caft out into outer darknefs," &c.; no one will fuppofe, that the *children* of the *kingdom*, in the above quotation, are the fame with thofe in the parable. Whatever is born of God, is a child of God; and this may be faid of a perfon who is born into the kingdom of truth and grace; or of that true *faith* by which he is fo born, this faith being a divine production. For proof, fee 1 John iii. 9. "Whofoever is born of God doth not commit fin." Here, no doubt a human being may be intended; again, fee chap. v. 4. "For *whatfoever* is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*." In this paffage, true faith is faid to be born of God, and therefore my idea that the truths of the gofpel ought to be confidered the children of the kingdom, according to the parable, may appear confiftent. I am difpofed, however, to condefcend fo much to my opponent, as to acknowledge, that the wicked are fometimes faid to be the *children* of the devil, &c. fee St. John viii. 44. "Ye are of your father the devil." See verfe 37. "I know that ye be Abraham's feed." Again, verfe 39. "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." I am fure, my opponent would not wifh to prove more from the above quotations than that thofe Jews were *virtually* the

children of Abraham, but *characteriſtically* the children of the devil. Then, admitting wicked men are repreſented by tares in the parable, and this repreſentation is a repreſentation of character, then the deſtruction of the tares ſignifies a *deſtruction* of *evil* character, which argument, though I do not want, is forced upon me to my advantage in the query.

The whole of the 25th chapter of Matthew, which contains the parable of the virgins, of the talents, and of the ſheep and goats, is conſidered directly againſt the univerſal holineſs and happineſs of mankind. In the parable of the virgins, thoſe were called fooliſh who took no oil in their veſſels with their lamps, who were not ready to go into the marriage when the bridegroom came, but afterwards knocked, ſaying, *Lord*, *Lord*, open unto us, but were anſwered by Chriſt, "Verily I ſay unto you, I know you not."

Thoſe fooliſh virgins, ſays my oppoſer, repreſent thoſe who are to be rejected at laſt, who will be miſerable as long as God exiſts. On ſuppoſition that were the caſe, how can it be proved? Is there any thing in this ſcripture, that poſitively teſtifies that to be the caſe? My opponent will not contend there is, but only a parabolical alluſion to the eternal deſtruction of the wicked, not poſitive teſtimony of it. But I wiſh to ſay, it is my opinion, that a doctrine ought to be proved by plain teſtimony, before we can be authorized to apply allegories and parables to it. Suppoſing I were unable to give any rational account of the meaning of this parable, would it give my opponent any advantage? Would it not reſt with him to prove that his application of the parable is juſt, before he ought to bring it as an objection againſt

the doctrine for which I argue? If the reader can find any thing in the parable which neceſſarily means endleſs miſery, all I can ſay, is, he has made a diſcovery which I have not. But as I do not judge myſelf altogether ignorant of the true meaning of this parable, I will trouble the reader with a few inquiries explanatory of the paſſage. "Then ſhall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When? Is that time yet future? If it be, nothing is to be underſtood by the connexion of the diſcourſe. The word, *then*, has reference to a deſignated time, which we find in the 24th chap. and 34th verſe, "Verily I ſay unto you, this generation ſhall not paſs, till all theſe things ſhall be fulfilled." According to the words of Chriſt, who undoubtedly knew his own meaning better than we do, all things prophesied of, in the 24th chap. were fulfilled in that generation. Look back to the 23d chap. and 36th verſe, "Verily I ſay unto you, all theſe things ſhall come upon this generation." The time of that generation was the time of the fulfilment of all things ſpoken of in the 24th and 25th chapters; there is no other time deſignated for the word, *then*, to apply to. I muſt inquire, what kingdom of heaven this is, which is repreſented by ten virgins, five of which are wiſe and five are fooliſh. One half of the kingdom of heaven, according to this parable, is compoſed of fooliſh virgins! This cannot mean the kingdom of eternal righteouſneſs, where wiſdom in her purity dwells.

The foregoing obſervations may prepare the mind for the following conciſe explanation. The Jews, or God's covenant people, under the legal diſpenſation, are here repreſented by ten virgins. The cloſe of the law diſpenſation, and the intro-

duction of the gofpel, is the time alluded to, in the parable. The lamps, fignify the rites and ordinances of the Levitical priefthood, which contained the light of the expected Meffiah. The oil, which the wife had in their veffels, with their lamps, was the knowledge of what thofe figures reprefented. The foolifh not looking from thefe rites to the antitype, but expecting falvation by the letter, were called foolifh. John was the friend of the bridegroom, and was the voice of one, crying, behold, the bridegroom cometh ; go ye out to meet him. Midnight, reprefents the ftate of grofs darknefs which then covered the people.

When Chrift entered the *fanctum fanctorum*, by his refurrection, and thofe whom he had chofen were ready, the door of the law was forever clofed. The fituation of the Jews, ever fince, is reprefented, by virgins without, knocking for entrance, &c.

The reader will undoubtedly acknowledge the propriety of the above fhort explanation, but will endeavor to make fome efforts againft me, with thofe blinded Jews. The idea, that the Jews were fo rejected by Chrift, that they would never obtain mercy by him, perhaps is not warrantable from the fcriptures. The reverfe appears evident, from the teftimony of Chrift to them, fee Matthew xxiii. 37, 38, 39. "O Jerufalem, Jerufalem, thou that killeft the prophets, and ftoneft them that are fent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your houfe is left unto you defolate ; for I fay unto you, ye fhall not fee me henceforth, till ye fhall *fay, bleffed* is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The fore part of the above is frequently recited, to prove the endlefs rejection of the Jews,

but the latter clauſe fully refutes ſuch a ſentiment. For, though Chriſt ſpake of the deſolate ſtate in which the Jews would be, for a ſeaſon; yet, he points to a time when they ſhould ſee him, and call him bleſſed. If my opponent can reconcile this glorious prophecy with the endleſs excluſion of thoſe Jews, I will not contend againſt him any more.

We ſhall find it no leſs difficult, to ſupport the doctrine of endleſs miſery, by the parable of the talents, than by the parable of the virgins. The words which cloſe this parable are what my opponent would found his objection upon, ſee verſe 30. "And caſt ye the unprofitable ſervant into outer darkneſs, there ſhall be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth." That, ſays my oppoſer, means *endleſs* miſery; but how am I to know it does? Or how does he know it? Does the text neceſſarily carry that meaning? No, it does not. The Pſalmiſt ſays, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." But if the night of weeping be endleſs, when will the morning of joy come? The prophet Iſaiah ſays, that God ſhall wipe tears from *all* faces; but if Chriſt meant, in this parable, that ſome of the human race ſhould weep to an endleſs eternity, he was of a different opinion from the prophet. Can we be juſtified, in explaining the ſcriptures into a poſitive contradiction? Muſt tradition cauſe the whole bible to bow down, on hearing all kinds of muſic, to the images which, by the craft of men, have been ſet up? Muſt the vain ſuppoſitions of men ſupercede the divine oracle? Muſt the divine light of the plain teſtimony of the ſpirit of phophecy become *dim* before the moon ſhine of tradition? Without explaining this parable particularly, which

I have done in my Notes, I dismiss it, observing, it represents the same to which I applied the former.

The parable of the sheep and goats, which concludes the 25th of Matthew, has been made great use of, to oppose universal holiness and happiness, and to support the doctrine of *endless* misery. Those arguments have been rested on the last words of the chapter, which read thus, "And these shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*." The word *everlasting*, being applied to the misery of the wicked, it is contended that it must be endless. But I have sufficiently proved, that the word, *everlasting*, is frequently applied to events which are not strictly *eternal*; therefore, to contend for endless misery, from the force of that word, is begging ground which ought to have been given up before now.

The adversaries of the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness have contended, with great seeming assurance, that if the word *everlasting*, which is here applied to the punishment of the wicked, do not mean an endless duration, the word *eternal*, used in the text, may not, as they both come from the same root; and consequently, they have urged that the happiness of the righteous may come to an end, if the misery of the wicked do. In answer to so much ingenuity and argument, I say, the word *eternal* is not applied to the *duration* of happiness, but to the nature of that life which is brought to light through the gospel; and as that life is of the nature of the unchangeable Deity, we justly believe it to be endless; but I grant the *word eternal*, being applied to it, does not prove it to be so. Neither do I suppose it *certain*, that those, who entered into this life, at

that time, continued invariably in the ſpirit of it. I believe a perſon may, by the grace of God, enter into the enjoyments of this eternal life, at one time, and at another, by reaſon of his folly, may loſe thoſe enjoyments. Now, having ſhown the weakneſs of what the pretended critic has argued, I will give a few leading features of the parable; not taking up time to be particular, for reaſons already given.

The time of Chriſt's coming in his glory, was the day of pentecoſt. His holy angels, with whom he came, were his choſen apoſtles. His glory, is the goſpel of eternal life. Sheep and goats, ſignify believers and unbelievers. *Right* hand and *left*, mean *goſpel* and *law*. The believer ſtands in the goſpel of life: The unbeliever is condemned already, and the wrath of God, in the letter of the law, abideth upon him. For proof, that Chriſt's coming was in that generation, ſee Matthew xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man ſhall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he ſhall reward every man according to his works. Verily I ſay unto you, there be ſome ſtanding here which ſhall not taſte of death, till they ſee the Son of man coming in his kingdom." If Chriſt is to be underſtood as he ſaid, if his words explain his meaning, it is clear, that his coming in his glory, with his angels, to reward men, according to their works, was ſome time in the lifetime of thoſe to whom he ſpake. If this be true, which my opponent with his eyes open, will not diſpute, then no objection can be ſtated, from this parable, againſt the final holineſs and happineſs of all men. Should any ſay, (as many have ſaid) that they ſee no parable in the laſt paragraph of the 25th of St. Matthew, I will only

add, if there be no parable in it, it only reſpects two kinds of animals, called ſheep and goats, and we have nothing to do with it. We come to the laſt paragraph in the 16th of St. Luke, of which, much uſe has been made againſt the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs; and is ſaid to contain a very literal account of the death of a rich man, and of his being in hell, after death; and the death of a poor man, and his future happineſs. It is contended, by the moſt of thoſe who oppoſe the doctrine which I endeavor to vindicate, that this paragraph ought to be taken and underſtood in its moſt literal ſenſe, and that Chriſt did not intend it as a parable. Though I am very far from believing this paragraph to be a literal account, yet, I will admit it, for the better accommodating of the argument. For if I do not, but only give my opinion on the paſſage, my opponent will contend, that the objection is not anſwered, as he reſts it on the literality of the paſſage. Admitting the account juſt as literal as my oppoſer views it, is it poſſible for him to ſubſtantiate an objection againſt me, from it? I think not; for, were it poſſible to prove, than an individual, who died in the days of Noah, had continued, from that time until now, in a ſtate of miſery, it would have no force to prove, that ſuch individual would be miſerable a ſingle year longer, much leſs, to prove he would be endleſsly ſo. Further, could it be proved, that a perſon, who recently died, would be in the worſt of torments, for a *million* of years to come, it would fall infinitely ſhort of proving that he would ſuffer *endleſsly*. If the ſuffering of a rational being, for a time, prove, that this being muſt be *endleſsly* miſerable, the proof ſtands againſt the whole family of Adam, not excepting Jeſus

himſelf. If my opponent be under the neceſſity of giving me the argument, in this particular, which I know he muſt, then, what evidence has he left, in the ſcripture under conſideration, to prove *endleſs* miſery? If it be urged againſt me, that the *gulph*, between Abraham and the rich man, was *impaſſable*, it proves nothing, with regard to its duration. Let us now examine the paſſage a little, taking notice of the common ideas of it. It is ſaid, that the rich man lifted up his eyes in *hell*. Now it is believed and argued, that ſouls, in hell, are as deſtitute of any principle of goodneſs, as the devil in which people believe; that they are fully engaged in the devil's ſervice, and oppoſed to any thing and all things which are favorable to the kingdom of the Saviour. This being the caſe, how is it that we have ſuch an account of the prayer which the rich man made to his father Abraham, in favor of his five brethren? He ſeems to be anxious for their welfare, and deſires that they might not come into ſuch a place of torment as he was in. How would ſuch a prayer pleaſe Belzebub, the prince of devils? Did I believe in ſuch a being, according to the general idea which people have of him, I ſhould ſuppoſe he would be very much alarmed, on hearing ſuch benevolent prayers made in his dark dominions! The prayer ſeems to favor the plan of goſpel grace, more than the vile purpoſes of Satan, though it did not ſeem to dictate the matter exactly according to the divine purpoſe. It is generally believed that the devil is deſirous of getting as many as poſſible into miſery; if ſo, and the rich man deſired that his brethren might not come into that place of torment, let his reaſons be what they might, it is evident that his deſires were oppoſed

to the devil's. "A kingdom, divided againſt itſelf, cannot ſtand." Again, it is argued, by ſome, that thoſe who are in heaven will rejoice, in conſequence of the miſery of thoſe whom they ſee in torment, as the juſtice of God will, by their torments, be made to appear more glorious than it otherwiſe could, which, by the way, anſwers the moſt fervent deſires of Satan. This being granted, ſhould thoſe, who are in heaven, on ſeeing thoſe in hell, who, in this world, were their neareſt connexions, feel the ſmalleſt regret, much more, deſire to grant them aſſiſtance, it would be a complete violation of that juſtice which confined them there. But in our text, it is ſhown, that thoſe, who are in Abraham's boſom, are deſirous of going to the rich man, and their object is plainly ſeen, that it is to relieve him from his torments, ſee verſe 26, "So that *thoſe* who *would paſs* from *hence* to *you* cannot." It is very evident, that thoſe, who were in Abraham's boſom, were deſirous of aſſiſting the rich man; and, according to the common idea, it muſt have been deemed a rebellion againſt the will and juſtice of God, in conſequence of which, if the devil deſerved to be caſt out of heaven, for his diſobedience, theſe undoubtedly deſerved the ſame condemnation! If we look impartially into theſe things, it is eaſy to ſee, that ſomething wrong has been entertained in the common idea. By a little attention to the introduction of this paragraph, the reader may eaſily ſee the whole was intended as a ſimilitude, to ſhow the *adultery* which the high prieſt would commit, in rejecting the goſpel, and endeavoring to obtain juſtification, by attending to the law in the letter, the ſituation of that part of Iſrael that was broken off through unbelief, which is repreſented by

five foolish virgins in the 25th of Matthew; the conversion of the Gentiles to christianity, and their reception into Abraham's *faith*, &c.

We pass to take notice of 2d Thess. i. 7, 8, 9. My opponent depends on the words, "everlasting destruction," on which to found his argument against the salvation of all men; but as I have before proved, that the word, *everlasting*, does not necessarily mean an endless duration, my opponent would fail in his argument, even if he could show, that the word, *everlasting*, in the text, was applied to the duration of suffering; but this he cannot do; for the word, *everlasting*, is not applied to the *duration* of *punishment*, but to the *destruction* with which the sinner is punished. That which is destroyed, I grant, is endlessly destroyed. But here I call in my key text, to show, that it is the hay, wood and stubble, which are to be destroyed. This will appear evident, if we observe the nature of the fire mentioned in our text. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed* from *heaven*, with his mighty angels *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance," &c. This fire is that *in* which *Christ* is revealed, and it comes from heaven. Is not this the *fire* with which he baptizes? Is not the fire revealed, to destroy the hay, the wood, and the stubble? Undoubtedly; and is the endless misery of the sinner to be proved, from the action of that divine fire which alone is able to effect his salvation? But the objector says, the text reads for itself, "Who shall be *punished* with *everlasting* destruction, *from* the presence of the Lord, and *from* the glory of his power;" and if the sinner be punished *from* the presence of the Lord, he cannot be blessed *in* it, where there are joys forever more. Answer, there

is not a place in the univerſe which is *out* of the preſence of an *omnipreſent* God; therefore, to put a ſinner from the preſence of the Lord, he muſt be put out of the univerſe. But what means the text? ſays the reader; anſwer, that divine light and heat, which deſtroys moral darkneſs, and purges man from all ſin is *from* the preſence of the Lord as a production of the divine preſence, as it is written concerning the man of ſin, whom the Lord ſhall conſume with the breath of his mouth, and deſtroy with the brightneſs of his coming. If God were not able to puniſh the ſinner, in the manner deſcribed in the text, I ſhould deſpair of his ſalvation; but bleſſed be that divine ſpirit of light and love; it truly takes ſuch vengeance on the ſinner as is worthy of a God. It makes him hate ſin, brings down the high mountains of his pride, takes away the fig-leaf garment, and clothes the man in his right mind.

There is a paſſage in the 12th of Matthew, the 31ſt and 32d verſes, which has been contended for as an unanſwerable objection to univerſal ſalvation. The text reads thus, "Wherefore I ſay unto you, all manner of ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiven unto men; but the blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven unto men. And whoſoever ſpeaketh a word againſt the Son of man, it ſhall be forgiven him; but whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him neither in this world, nor in the world to come." The common idea, of *this world and the world to come*, is the preſent life of man on earth, and that ſtate in which man exiſts hereafter. Could it be proved, that this was the right meaning of the word, *world*, there would be ſomething more in the text than I can now ſee. Some, who

have ably defended the doctrine of univerſal ſalvation, have admitted the common idea of the paſſage, ſo far as it goes to prove future miſery, yet, have abundantly proved, that it would come to an end: But if the word *world*, have the ſignification of *age*, or *diſpenſation*, as will not be diſputed, it will be impoſſible to prove, that any thing, beyond what may be experienced by men, in this mortal ſtate, was intended, in this text. We are informed, that Chriſt came once in the *end* of the *world*, to put away ſin, by the ſacrifice of himſelf. The *world*, in the end of which Chriſt came, was undoubtedly the *diſpenſation* of the legal prieſthood; according to which idea, the *world*, which was then to come, is the diſpenſation of goſpel light which roſe on the gentile world, for the purpoſe of bringing them to the knowledge and worſhip of the true God; which diſpenſation ends with the converſion of the fulneſs of the Gentiles, and will be ſucceeded by that in which Iſrael will be viſited by the ſpirit of their Meſſiah, and ſhall ſay, Bleſſed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.

What I have written on this ſubject will ſhow the reader the propriety of ſuppoſing, that the *ſin*, which the phariſees committed, in blaſpheming the Holy Spirit, by which Chriſt wrought miracles, has been viſited upon their deſcendants even to this day, and will continue upon them, until the fulneſs of the Gentiles be come in. But I ſee no need of carrying the meaning of theſe words to an endleſs eternity, or even beyond the experience of man in this natural life. Therefore, admitting the doctrine of future puniſhment true, I cannot ſee it proved, from theſe words.

Could it be proved, that eternal or endlefs mifery was a natural production of the divine nature, there being an unchangeable principle to fupport fuch mifery; the argument, on my part, muft be given up. If fin be, in a moral fenfe, the caufe of mifery; fhould fin ever be brought to an end, its confequences, which are mifery, would alfo come to an end. If my opponent can tell me how Jefus will *finifh fin*, and make an *end* of tranfgreffion, and yet fin and tranfgreffion continue as long as God exifts, he will puzzle me more than all his objections have been able to do.

Having anfwered, as I hope, to the reader's fatisfaction, fome of the moft important objections againft God's univerfal goodnefs to his creatures, I fhall now turn on the other hand, and give the reader fome of my evidences for believing in the fo much defpifed doctrine of univerfal holinefs and happinefs. Firft, I reafon from the nature of divine goodnefs, in which all pretend to believe, and none dare, in a direct fenfe, to deny, that God could not, confiftent with himfelf, create a being that would experience more *mifery* than *happinefs*. Secondly, if God be infinitely good, his goodnefs is commenfurate with his power and knowledge; then, all beings whom his power produced, are the objects of his goodnefs; and to prove, that any being was deftitute of it, would prove, that Deity's knowledge did not comprehend fuch being. Thirdly, there is as much propriety, in faying, that God is *infinite* in *power*, but that he did not create *all* things; as there is, in faying, though God be infinite in goodnefs, yet, part of his creatures will never be the partakers of it. It might as well be faid, that God is infinite in knowledge, and yet ignorant of the moft part of events which

are daily and hourly taking place; as to ſay, that he is infinitely good, and yet only a few of his creatures were deſigned for happineſs. Fourthly, if the Almighty, as we believe him to be, did not poſſeſs power ſufficient to make all his creatures happy, it was not an act of goodneſs in him to create them. If he have that power, but poſſeſs no will for it, it makes a bad matter as much worſe as is poſſible. I then reduce my opponent to the neceſſity of telling me, if thoſe, whom he believes will be endleſsly loſt, be thoſe whom God *could* ſave, but *would* not! or thoſe whom he *would* ſave, but *could* not! if it be granted, that God has both power and will to ſave all men, it is granting all I want, for a foundation of my faith.

I would further argue, that, as man is conſtituted to enjoy happineſs, on moral principles, (to the knowledge of which principles we come by degrees) it is as reaſonable to believe that all men were intended to obtain a conſummate knowledge of the moral principles of their nature, as that any of Adam's race were. There is not an individual of the whole family of man, who is perfectly ſatisfied with thoſe enjoyments which earth and time afford him; the ſoul is conſtituted for nobler pleaſures, which, to me, is an evidence that God has provided, for all men, ſome better things than can be found in earthly enjoyments, where we find but little except vanity and diſappointment. There is an immortal deſire, in every ſoul, for future exiſtence and happineſs: For the truth of this aſſertion I appeal to the conſciences of my readers. Why ſhould the Almighty implant this deſire in us, if he never intended to ſatisfy it? Suppoſing a mother has the power of modifying the deſires and appetite of her child, would ſhe cauſe it to want that which ſhe could

not get for it? Would ſhe take pleaſure in ſeeing her child pine for fruits which did not grow in the country where ſhe lived, and which ſhe could not get? Or, would ſhe prefer the anguiſh of the child, to its happineſs, when it was in her power to grant all it wanted? If ſuch a mother were to be found, who would call her a godly woman? Could her child, thus tormented, riſe up and call her bleſſed? No, ſurely, it could not.

I further argue, that, all wiſe, good, and examplary men, wiſh for the truth of the doctrine for which I contend; they earneſtly pray for the ſalvation of all men, and do all in their power, by the grace of God, to diſſuade men from ſin, to the obedience of the goſpel; they enliſt willingly into the ſervice of virtue, to endeavor to win proſelytes to holineſs; their object is the deſtruction of ſin, and the advancement of righteouſneſs; and they believe, and I think juſtly, that God will bleſs their labors.

None, but wicked men, would wiſh for the endleſs duration of ſin; were it left to the carnal mind, it would wiſh for nothing but the privilege of drinking in iniquity forever But thoſe, who truly love God and holineſs, deſire, night and day, to overcome the vile propenſities of their own deceitful hearts, and pray for the reconciliation of others to *holineſs* and *happineſs*. Now, why ſhould we ſuppoſe that God is more of the mind of the wicked, than of the righteous? If it be God's ſpirit in us, which cauſes us to pray for the deſtruction of ſin, is it reaſonable, to ſay, that this ſame ſpirit has determined that ſin ſhall always exiſt? Are we not right, in judging of the nature and character of God, from the dictates of his ſpirit in us? If ſo, does this ſpirit teach us the

neceſſity of endleſs tranſgreſſion and miſery? I wiſh the reader to keep in mind, that I hold ſin and miſery inſeparably connected, and holineſs and happineſs ſo likewiſe.

I further argue, if any of the human race be endleſsly miſerable, the whole muſt be, providing they all know it; for, reaſoning from that ſpirit of benevolence which is neceſſary to a conformity to the principles of holineſs, I prove it impoſſible for a well diſpoſed man to ſee another in miſery, without bearing a very ſenſible proportion of ſuch miſery. If it be argued, that this idea is wrong, and that the ſpirit which dictates it, is of the evil one; I ſay, in anſwer, all good men in the world feel it to be a truth; and no man ever exhibited more of it than the Saviour of the world. Man is conſtituted with powers of ſympathy; and while theſe principles laſt, he cannot enjoy *complete* happineſs, and ſee one of his fellow creatures in torment. I miſtruſt, ſome one will ſay, then *Chriſt* is not completely happy, nor the ſaints who have gone before us. I have no objection to the obſervation; but think I ſee a divine beauty in the idea. I will query a little, on the ſubject. It is generally believed, that Chriſt exiſted, before he was born in Bethlehem; and it is evident, from the ſcriptures, that he did. But I would inquire, what was his ſituation? Was it a ſtate of *complete happineſs?* I think likely this queſtion will generally be anſwered in the affirmative. Then I further aſk, had he no deſire for the ſalvation of ſinners, before he came into our world? Here the queſtion *muſt* be anſwered in the affirmative, let the other queſtion be anſwered as it may; for, if that were not the caſe, why did he come for the expreſs purpoſe of ſaving them? If he willed and intend-

ed the ſalvation of mankind, and alſo determined to encounter all the ſufferings that were finally laid upon him, in favor of ſo worthy an object, it is evident his happineſs was not complete; neither do I believe it will be, until he ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul and be ſatisfied.

If any one ſhould be ſo particular as to query, aſking, if the Almighty himſelf be not deſirous of the ſalvation of ſinners; and if ſo, how can his happineſs be complete? I anſwer, a being, to whom events do not take place in ſucceſſion, nor time paſs away, with whom an eternity is a preſent now, whoſe knowledge, is intuitive, and who can neither hope nor anticipate, can neither increaſe nor decreaſe in happineſs. But when we ſpeak of *God*, abſtractedly, our words ought to be few and choſen.

I have, I think, ſufficiently proved, in this work, that Jeſus Chriſt is *a created*, dependent being, and that he ſtands at the head of the creation of man, &c. If I be right, in that idea, I think I may reaſonably argue, that he is a being to whom events take place in ſucceſſion, who hopes and anticipates, and who, for the joy ſet before him, endured the croſs, and deſpiſed the ſhame. Therefore, until the great work of his miſſion is completed, I cannot conceive that his happineſs will be *complete*. If it be argued, that Chriſt, when on the croſs, ſaid it was finiſhed, and that, in a moral ſenſe, he felt no more pain for ſinners, I have a right to object, for I do not know what warrant the ſcripture gives, for believing *all* this argument. That the ſufferings of Chriſt, as to anſwer the type of a ſin-offering, were then ended, is a reaſonable idea; but to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt was then diſpoſſeſſed of that principle which cauſed him to feel for the woe of mankind, does not appear reaſonable. I

have no idea, that the glorious Captain of our ſalvation now ſuffers, as he did, when he ſaid, "*My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?*" But I believe, that he, whoſe ſoul travailed for the redemption of man, now increaſes in joy, as the work of reconciliation is going on, to the deſtruction of ſin, and the converſion of ſinners. He has told us, that there is more joy, in the preſence of the angels, over *one* ſinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine juſt perſons who need no repentance. I do not conceive, that one part of human nature can be made perfectly happy, while the reſt are in miſery. When St. Paul ſpake of thoſe who died in faith, not having obtained the promiſe, he ſays, "God having provided ſome better things for us, that they, without us, could not be made perfect."

Thoſe, who are the moſt devout on earth, are the moſt deſirous for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the deliverance of themſelves and their fellow men, from ſin and miſery. For the ſake of a caſe, I will ſuppoſe a chriſtian, to-day, is exerciſed with fervent deſires for the reconciliation of ſinners; at night, he dies. Do all thoſe holy deſires ceaſe, at death? If they do not, but do continue, though the happineſs of the ſoul be great, yet, it is, at leaſt, capable of being enlarged, or increaſed, by the proſperity of the Redeemer's cauſe among men.

How the idea ever got place in the human mind, that, even fathers and mothers, in the world to come, would rejoice, to ſee their own offſpring in endleſs flames and hopeleſs torments, I can hardly conceive; though the probability is, it was firſt invented, to ſhun, in theory, thoſe difficulties not otherwiſe to be avoided. I wiſh to uſe this error

as prudently as poſſible; but I wiſh to have it rightly underſtood, and judged of impartially. Will perfect reconciliation to God have this effect? I know it is contended, that it will; but what evidence have we of it? Was not Chriſt reconciled, or in a ſtate of conformity to God's law? Did he manifeſt joy, at the ſufferings of mankind? When he looked on Jeruſalem, that abominable city, and knew that its chiefs would be his murderers, when he ſpake of the dreadful calamities juſt ready to burſt on their devoted heads, how did he feel? Streams of ſorrow brake from the eye of innocence; in his grief, he ſpake of their deſtruction, but propheſies of their ſeeing him again, when they ſhould welcome him, ſaying, "*Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!*"

If perfect reconciliation to God will effect complete happineſs at the ſight of human miſery, the more we are reconciled to God, the more ſatisfaction we ſhould take in ſeeing our fellow creatures miſerable! Then, thoſe, who can look on men in diſtreſs, with the leaſt ſorrow, are the moſt reconciled to divine goodneſs; and thoſe, who feel the moſt ſorrow at the afflictions of their fellow men, are the moſt perverſe and wicked! Some may ſay, heaven is entirely different from this world, and when we get there, we ſhall be totally changed from what we now are; therefore, it will not do to argue, what we ſhall be there, from what we ought to be here. Then the awful fact is, all we call goodneſs here, will be called badneſs there; and that which we call badneſs here, will be goodneſs there!

If the effects of moral holineſs, in the world to come, ſhould be different from what they are here, I wiſh to be informed on what moral principle

the change is made. If theſe things be ſo, the ſouls of the cruel need but little alteration, to prepare them for heaven, and that little laid out in making them what we ſhould call worſe. Such a heaven as this, does not, I hope, exiſt in the univerſe. My opponent will urge his argument ſtill further, on this ſubject, and ſay, it is not the *miſery* of the wicked that affords ſo much pleaſure to thoſe who are in heaven, but their *joy is increaſed*, in conſequence of the *execution of juſtice*. This, however, is giving up what is contended for, viz. that every degree of miſery will create thouſands of degrees of happineſs, becauſe, could divine juſtice be as well underſtood, without this miſery, as with it, the miſery itſelf would do no good. I am willing to grant, that a good man will prefer the execution of juſtice, to his own private eaſe, or the *partial* happineſs of a criminal. But how would a judge appear who ſhould manifeſt joy and gladneſs, on pronouncing the ſentence of death upon one of his fellow men? Who would not turn from ſuch a court with diſguſt and deep abhorrence? To call ſuch a circumſtance an inſtance in which men have an occaſion to rejoice, is a violation of our ſenſes. I will ſay, for myſelf, I neither expect, nor deſire, perfect happineſs, while I ſee my fellow men in miſery; I had rather be poſſeſſed of that *ſympathy* which cauſes me to *feel* for *another*, than to *enjoy* an *unſocial pleaſure* in a *froſty heaven* of *miſanthropy!* Is it poſſible, that we ſhould be *completely happy*, and ſee thoſe in *miſery* whom we *love?* No one will ſay we can. Are we not commanded to love our enemies? Can we be truly happy, and not love them? Surely we cannot; then how can we be completely happy, and ſee them miſerable? A parent may be perſuaded to

attend his child, while a ſurgeon performs an amputation; but with what acute feelings his heart is agitated! How eagerly would he inhale the pain, and make it his own, if it were poſſible? But there is ſomething in all this, that is tolerable; he is in hopes of ſaving the life of his child: Were it not for his hopes, could he endure the ſight? But what is all this, compared with a parent viewing his child in endleſs flames! O, parents, what a bleſſed circumſtance it is, that, when we are called to part with our children, on earth, we can mingle a little joy with the ſorrow, in hoping they belong to the deathleſs family in heaven! If the good deſires, which are found in the chriſtian heart, are ever to be ſatisfied, univerſal ſubjection to the government of Chriſt will ſurely take place: If virtue ever gain an univerſal victory over ſin and vice, univerſal holineſs and happineſs will be the conſequence. Man exiſts on ſuch a principle, as renders him capable of improving in knowledge and happineſs, which he obtains by experience; and it is very evident, that, as the wheels of time move, man is faſt advancing, which favors the idea, that, at ſome period, known to *Deity*, the deſired haven will be obtained, in the acquiſition of that wiſdom which is from above.

When we ſend our children to ſchool, it is for the purpoſe of learning that of which they are ignorant; and it is by degrees, that thoſe ſciences are obtained, which conſtitute them learned. When a child firſt takes a quill in hand to write, he blunders, but does not blunder ſo as to imitate the copy, neither will two out of a thouſand imitate each other.

Men begin their moral exiſtence, in their ſeparate capacity, in the ſame way; unacquainted with

the ſkill of their divine preceptor, they err from ſacred rules, and differ from their fellow pupils. Jars and broils enſue, and ſorrow and woe are the conſequences. But as faſt as they become taught, they conform to the divine rules of their maſter, and learn, that their happineſs conſiſts in being united. Happineſs is the greateſt object of all rational beings, and no one will follow any particular object any longer than he thinks it ſubſervient to his main one. The reaſon why men ſin, is, they think, and think erroneouſly, that they ſhall obtain more happineſs in ſo doing, than in following the dictates of truth. But is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the error will never be diſcovered? Will the ſinner never find his miſtake? O yes, ſays my oppoſer, to his eternal confuſion and endleſs miſery! but ſtop a moment; if he find his miſtake, he will abandon the object; and when he ceaſes to ſin, he begins to reform, and approximate towards holineſs and happineſs. I have ſufficiently argued, that man cannot be miſerable, in conſequence of moral condemnation, any longer than he is in, a moral ſenſe, a ſinner. Then he muſt ſin, endleſsly, in order to be miſerable ſo long; which if ſo, he will never find his miſtake, he will never learn that righteouſneſs and truth are more productive of happineſs than ſin. But I think it erroneous, to ſuppoſe, that a being, who is capable of learning any thing, cannot learn, ſometime ſhort of *eternity*, that it is better to do *right*, than *wrong*. Should we argue, however, that that might, in ſome caſes, be true, it would deſtroy the idea of complete and poſitive miſery, for which my opponent contends. Complete miſery would not admit of a proſpect which could adminiſter the ſmalleſt *hope;* in which caſe, the

ſoul would have no object which could poſſibly induce it to action; then would the ſoul become inert, and its *exiſtence* would be *deſtroyed,* and become not a ſubject of happineſs, or miſery.

I would argue again, from a reaſonable idea, admitted by all, viz. that mankind, in their moral exiſtence, originated in God. Why then do we deny his final aſſimilation with the fountain from whence he ſprang? The ſtreams and rivulets which water the hill-country, run in every direction, as the make of land occaſions. They are ſtained with various mines and ſoils, through which they paſs; but at laſt they find their entrance into the ocean, where their different courſes are at an end, and they are tempered like the fountain which receives them. Though man, at preſent, forms an aſpect ſimilar to the waters in their various courſes, yet, in the end of his race, I hope he will enjoy an union with his God, and with his fellows.

Having given a few hints, from the nature of moral beings, in favor of my general plan, I ſhall beg the attention of the reader to ſome evidences, from the ſcriptures of truth, in favor of univerſal holineſs and happineſs. The method I intend to purſue will be concluſive; for I am determined to admit no ſcripture, as evidence, in this caſe, that needs any interpretation to cauſe it to mean what I wiſh to prove; therefore, I ſhall produce but a ſmall part of the ſcriptures which I conceive have a direct meaning in favor of univerſaliſm.

It will not be doubted, that man was created in Chriſt, who, the apoſtle ſays, is the *head* of *every* man. To this point, I have already attended in this work, and ſufficiently proved it. I have, alſo, argued, that the *formation* of man was *after* his *creation,* as appears from the account given in

Geneſis. Now, what I wiſh to prove, from ſcripture, is a complete deliverance of the whole humanity from mortality, and the governing power of the law of ſin which is found in our members, to a reinſtatement in the heavenly Adam of immortality, where the law of the ſpirit of life will be the whole governing power, to which man will be ſubjected. It ſeems reaſonable to conclude, that man, in a *ſpiritual ſenſe*, was created in *Chriſt*, the *heavenly nature*, as his body was *formed* in *Adam*, the *earthly*. And as all our *bodies* came from that *one formation*, ſo all our *ſpirits* came from that *one creation*. As it is by the *nature* of this one *formed* creature, that we are all brought into a ſtate of *moral death*, ſo it muſt be by the *ſpirit* of this one *created* man that all will be brought, finally, to the enjoyment of *ſpiritual life* and *peace*. There is a paſſage in Acts iii. 20, 21, which reads very literally, in proof of my argument. "And he ſhall ſend Jeſus Chriſt, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven muſt receive until the *times* of *reſtitution* of *all things*, which God hath ſpoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets ſince the world began." Can there be any diſpute, in the reader's mind, reſpecting the nature of this reſtitution? Will any one pretend, that this reſtitution is only reinſtating man in a ſtate of probation? If that were the object of Chriſt's coming into our world, if that were intended by his death and reſurrection, was not the work already done, when Peter ſpake theſe words? Why then does he ſpeak of the *times* of reſtitution yet to come? Or, if this reſtitution of *all* things only meant the reſtitution of honor to the law, by the ſufferings of Chriſt, I aſk, again, was this not alſo paſt, when Peter ſpake theſe words? I

cannot conceive, that a reſtitution of man to any ſtate which he has occupied, in fleſh and blood, is worthy of the goſpel plan; for it is ſaid of man, in his earthly nature, his *beſt* eſtate is *vanity*. But if we view the plan of the reſtitution of all things, which is to be accompliſhed in the fulneſs of times, a reſtitution or reſtoration from mortality and ſin, to a ſtate of immortality and righteouſneſs, it is conſiſtent with ſcripture, and worthy of God. If my opponent, in his ſtruggles, ſhould ſay, *things* do not refer to *men*, I would aſk, what the word *things*, does mean in ſcripture, when uſed as it is in the paſſage quoted? I cannot gueſs, to what he would apply it. I will quote two paſſages more, where the word is uſed; ſee Col. i. 20. "And (having made peace through the blood of his croſs) by him to reconcile *all things* to himſelf, by him, I ſay, whether they be *things* in earth, or *things* in heaven." That the *things* to be reconciled are *men*, may be ſeen, by verſe 21. "And you that were ſometimes alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." The way, in which Chriſt effected this work, is expreſſed in the 22d verſe, "in the body of his fleſh, through death, to preſent you holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in his ſight." Eph. i. 10. "That in the diſpenſation of the *fulneſs* of *times*, he might gather together *in one all things* in Chriſt, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." The reader will do well to obſerve the ſimilarity between the laſt quoted paſſage and that in Acts. *There*, it is ſaid, "until the *times* of the *reſtitution* of *all things*," and *here*, it is ſaid, "that in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of *times*, he might gather together in one *all things* in Chriſt." The 11th verſe ſays, "in whom alſo *we* have obtain-

ed an inheritance." No doubt can be entertained, respecting the *things* to be restored and reconciled, and gathered together in Christ. There is part of the words of Peter which I quoted from Acts, which ought to be particularly noticed, in order to cause those who have said, the doctrine for which I contend is a new doctrine, to consider whether they are right, in that matter. The words are these, "Which *God* hath spoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets, since the world began." If *all* God's holy prophets believed in the doctrine of the restitution of *all* things, I hardly think it is so modern as some pretend.

I will next call the attention of the reader to what the holy prophets have said, in support of the doctrine of the restitution of all things: But as their testimony stands on the promise of God to Abraham, which contains the fulness of the doctrine for which I contend, I will notice it, in the first place, as the sum of all which the prophets have said, concerning the coming of the Just One, and the glory of his kingdom; see Genesis xii. 3. "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." This promise is expressed in chap. xxii. verse 18, thus, "And in thy *seed* shall *all* the nations of the earth be blessed." That there may be no dispute what this blessing is, and that the reader may see it to be *justification* through faith, see Gal. iii. 8. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through *faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." What a glorious foundation for hope is here. How blessed was Abraham when he rejoiced in the day of Jesus. How blessed were the prophets of the Lord who saw these things,

though afar off; the ſight weaned their affections from all earthly things; they ſought a city which hath *foundation*, whoſe builder and maker is God. O, thanks be to my God, ſince I can call thee ſo; the belief of this, thy promiſe, produces as much heaven, as I am able to bear, while in the body. When Jacob bleſſed his ſons, he ſpake of the coming of Shiloh, unto whom, ſaith he, ſhall the gathering of the people be; ſee Geneſis xlix. 10. How exactly does this teſtimony of the patriarch agree with that of the apoſtle's; "Unto him ſhall the *gathering* of the *people* be," "That in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, he might *gather together* in *one all things* in *Chriſt*." We will hear what the prophet David, ſays, concerning the kingdom of Chriſt, Pſalm lxxii. 11. "Yea, *all* kings ſhall fall down before him; *all nations* ſhall *ſerve* him." Verſe 14. "He ſhall redeem their ſoul from deceit and violence." Verſe 17. "And men ſhall be bleſſed in him, *all* nations ſhall call him bleſſed." If any wiſh to argue, that David meant no other than Solomon, by the king's ſon, let them take notice of the 7th and 8th verſes. "In his days ſhall the righteous flouriſh; and abundance of peace ſo long as the moon endureth. He ſhall have dominion alſo from ſea to ſea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." The moon yet endures, but the reign of Solomon does not. The kingdom ſpoken of, in the text, was to be univerſal; but Solomon's was not. Let us take particular notice of the 11th verſe. "Yea, *all* kings ſhall fall down before him." Shall *all* the cruel tyrants of the earth bow down to him who was born in a ſtable? Shall *all* the haughty kings of proud and wealthy nations, bow down to him whoſe choſen companions when on earth were

poor fiſhermen? Will you, my opponent, ſay, this is a pleaſing doctrine to the carnal mind? Herod, who cauſed the maſſacre in Bethlehem, in order to murder Chriſt in infancy, could hardly be perſuaded that it was agreeable to his carnal mind to bow before Jeſus, at the head of this little band of martyrs. No, carnal mind muſt be crucified before all this can be done.

Would it pleaſe the preſent kings of Europe, to tell them, to beat their ſwords into ploughſhares, and their ſpears into pruning hooks, and to learn war no more? Would it be agreeable to their carnal, proud and haughty minds, to ſubmit to the religion of the Saviour? Which of them would, in order to gratify carnal mindedneſs, abandon all his equipage, his horſes and chariots of ſtate, mount a forlorn *aſs*, ride into an enemy's land, preach peace and ſalvation to his inveterate foes, die by cruel hands, and pray for his murderers in death? And can you believe that *all* the kings of the earth can bow down before the Saviour, with any more gratification to carnal mindedneſs, than they could imitate him, in his life and death? "*All nations* ſhall *ſerve* him." If *all* nations ſerve Chriſt, will they not all be bleſſed in him, according to the promiſe? I do not argue that any will be bleſſed in Chriſt, who do not ſerve him; but the text ſays, all nations *ſhall* ſerve him. Pſalm xxxvii. 10. "For yet a little while, and the wicked ſhall not be, yea, thou ſhalt diligently conſider his place, and it ſhall not be." Verſe 36. "Yet he paſſed away, and he was not, yea I ſought him, but he could not be found." If the wicked continue in ſin as long as God exiſts, it appears to me to be improper to ſay, yet a *little* while, and the *wicked* ſhall not *be*. And if God have prepared a *place* of

endleſs torments for the *wicked*, and that in *ſight* of the *righteous* in heaven, it is hardly proper to ſay, thou ſhalt diligently conſider his *place*, and it ſhall not *be*. And if the wicked are to be tormented forever, in ſight of the righteous, why is it ſaid, "I ſought him, but he could not be found?" Pſalm xxii. 27. "*All* the ends of the world ſhall *remember* and *turn* unto the Lord, and all the *kindreds* of the nations ſhall worſhip before thee." Who will doubt the ſalvation of thoſe who *turn* unto the Lord and worſhip before him? See Pſalm ii. 7, 8. "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath ſaid unto me, thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Aſk of me, and I ſhall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion." Compare this beautiful paſſage with one like it in Col. i. 19. "For it pleaſed the Father, that in him ſhould *all fulneſs dwell*." In what a capacious Saviour did David believe! Should a preacher, at the preſent day, recite the words which I have juſt quoted, he would immediately be accuſed of holding the heretical doctrine of *univerſal ſalvation*, as his hearers might be pleaſed to call it; or, ſhould he communicate the doctrine half as clearly as it is communicated in thoſe quotations, that part of his audience who were warmly oppoſed to the doctrine would grow uneaſy, while thoſe who favored the doctrine, would be ſatisfied their ſpeaker did ſo likewiſe. Some method muſt be uſed to explain thoſe ſcriptures differently from what they ſay, or the doctrine for which I contend is fairly proved by them.

Let us paſs to the prophecies of Iſaiah; ſee chap. xxv. 6, 7, 8. "And in this mountain ſhall the Lord of hoſts make unto *all* people a feaſt of fat

things, a feaſt of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will deſtroy in this mountain the *face* of the *covering* caſt over *all people*, and the veil that is ſpread over *all* nations. He will ſwallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people ſhall be taken away from off *all* the earth: for the Lord hath ſpoken it." No one will doubt, that the proviſions here ſpoken of are thoſe which are provided in the goſpel of ſalvation.

In the firſt place, then, obſerve, it is made for *all* people; this proves, that it was the intention of him who made the feaſt, that *all* people ſhould ſhare of its divine benefits.

2dly. It is teſtified, that the veil of darkneſs, which was over *all* people, ſhould finally be taken away.

3dly. That death is to be ſwallowed up in victory and tears wiped from off *all faces*. And,

Laſtly. That the rebuke of God's people ſhould be taken from off *all* the *earth*. And the evidence given to prove it would all be done, is, the Lord hath ſpoken it.

It is of no avail, for any to pretend, that though the proviſions of the goſpel were provided for *all* people, yet, *all* will not partake of them, let the reaſons be what they may; for, if God wipe tears from off *all* faces, *all* muſt receive the benefits of goſpel grace and peace. Compare this teſtimony with 1 Cor. xv. 54. "So when this corruptible ſhall have put on incorruption, and this mortal ſhall put on immortality, then ſhall be brought to paſs the ſaying that is written, death is ſwallowed up in victory." Again, with Rev. xxi. 4. "And God ſhall wipe away *all* tears from their

eyes, and there ſhall be no more death, neither ſorrow nor crying, neither ſhall there be any more pain : for the former things are paſſed away." How can it be juſtly ſaid, that death is ſwallowed up in victory, when the fact is, death will reign as long as God exiſts? Or, how can it be ſaid, that God ſhall wipe *all* tears from the eyes of men, if millions are to mourn to an endleſs eternity? Or, why is it ſaid, there ſhall be no more ſorrow, crying nor pain, if ſorrow, crying and infinite pain, are never to ceaſe? Iſaiah ix. 6, 7. the Saviour is propheſied of, as poſſeſſing a kingdom, the increaſe of which ſhould have no end. To the ſame purpoſe, ſee alſo Daniel vii. 14. "And there was given him *dominion*, and *glory*, and a kingdom, that *all people*, nations, and languages, ſhould ſerve him; his dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed."

Obſerve, "*All people*, *nations*, and languages, *ſhall ſerve him.*" If a great part of the human race are to exiſt in endleſs rebellion againſt Chriſt and his kingdom, it ſeems that the prophet was not only ignorant of it, but believed the reverſe. Iſaiah xlix. 6. "And he ſaid, it is a light thing that thou ſhouldeſt be my ſervant, to raiſe up the tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael: I will alſo give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be my *ſalvation* unto the ends of the earth." Verſe 8. "I will preſerve thee, and give thee for a *covenant* of the people," &c.

For the ſtrength of this *covenant* ſee Jer. xxxiii. 20. "Thus ſaith the Lord; if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there ſhould not be day and night

in their ſeaſon ; then may alſo my covenant be broken with David my ſervant," &c.

When men are poſſeſſed of ſufficient *agency* to ſtop the wheels of time, to ſilence the motion of the ſolar ſyſtem, and to diſannul God's covenant with day and night, then day and night will depend on the *will* of man. So, likewiſe, when he has *agency* to diſannul that covenant which is ordered, and in *all things* ſure, then his eternal ſalvation will depend on himſelf, and not on his God.

Attend to one ſimilitude of the Redeemer's glory from the prophecy of Ezekiel xvii. laſt paragraph, "Thus ſaith the Lord God, I will alſo take of the higheſt branch of the high cedar, and will ſet it ; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent : in the mountain of the height of Iſrael will I plant it : and it ſhall bring forth boughs and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar : and under it ſhall dwell all fowl of every wing ; in the ſhadow of the branches thereof ſhall they dwell. And all the trees of the field ſhall know that I the Lord have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flouriſh : I the Lord have ſpoken, and have done it." Time would fail me, to write one half that might be quoted from the prophets, on this ſubject. I aſk for no explanation, on their teſtimony ; if what they ſay, do not prove my doctrine, I will not have recourſe to explanations.

I have reaſoned, from the goodneſs of God, to prove, that it is his will, that all men ſhould, finally, be holy and happy ; I will now call proof from divine revelation, to the ſame idea ; ſee St. Paul's 1ſt Epiſtle to Timothy ii. 4. "Who will have *all*

men to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." What could induce St. Paul to write this ſentence, if he did not believe it? My opponent will ſay, he ſuppoſes Paul did believe it, and will acknowledge he believes it himſelf. Then, I ſay, all, for which I argue, is granted. But my opponent has a *method* by which he can *explain* this paſſage ſo that it may be true, and yet God may *will* the endleſs miſery of millions. It is only to ſay, that the paſſage is expreſſive of God's *revealed will*, but not of his *ſecret will;* arguing, that his *revealed will* is in *direct oppoſition* to a *will* which he has ſeen fit not to reveal!

Though much uſe is made of this method, in order to ſhun the force of this paſſage and many others, if there be any propriety in it, it is out of my ſight; or, if it would not betray a want of good ſenſe, in any other caſe, I will leave my reader to judge.

To ſay, God's *revealed will* is contrary to his eternal and unrevealed will, would, in me, be blaſphemy of the firſt magnitude; yet, I do not doubt the ſincerity of thoſe who frequently ſay it. But is it not in a direct ſenſe charging God with hypocriſy? However ſhocking it may ſeem, I know of no other light in which to view it.

Again, if God have a will which he has not revealed, and my opponent knows what it is, I would aſk how he came by this knowledge? God's revealed will is, that *all* men ſhould be ſaved; but his *ſecret* will is, that moſt of them ſhould be endleſsly miſerable! I would aſk, when this will was a ſecret? It has been openly talked of, by *limitarians*, ever ſince the light of the goſpel advanced ſo as to diſcover the apoſtacy of chriſtians.

St. Paul ſpeaks of the myſtery of God's will which he purpoſed in himſelf, which, the apoſtle ſays, God has made known; ſee Eph. i. 9. "Having made known unto us the myſtery of his will, according to his good pleaſure, which he purpoſed in himſelf." And in verſe 10, he tells what this *will* is; but it is very different from what my oppoſer ſays the *hidden* will of God is; "That in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, he might gather together in one *all* things in Chriſt, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." St. Peter ſays, God is not willing that any ſhould *periſh*, but that all ſhould come unto repentance.

In ſhort, I cannot ſee the propriety of ſaying that God *will* have *all* men to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth, if he predeſtinated, from all eternity, millions for endleſs miſery; and if he created any to glorify him, in endleſs torments, I cannot ſee why he ſhould not be willing for them to periſh, and anſwer the end for which he made them.

Again, what is that truth, which God wills *all* men to know? According to the words of the text, it muſt be a truth conſonant to their ſalvation, or they could not be ſaved, and yet believe the truth. For inſtance, ſuppoſe, out of the whole alphabet, all are to be endleſsly miſerable, except the *vowel* letters, and the whole alphabet was brought to the knowledge of the truth; ſurely the vowels would believe they were to be ſaved, but all the conſonants would believe they were going into endleſs torments; and the faith of the conſonants would be as *true* a faith, as that of the vowels; but how could the conſonants enjoy ſalvation, while poſſeſſing this faith?

There are ſome who do not admit my general ſyſtem, who will admit this part of it, viz. that it is the *will* of God, that all men ſhould finally be holy and happy; but ſay, at the ſame time, that it depends on the creature's accepting of offered mercy, on the rational conditions of goſpel obedience; making goſpel obedience a prerequiſition to ſalvation; while I contend, that goſpel obedience is, in fact, goſpel ſalvation.

To be ſaved from ſin is, ſurely, a goſpel ſalvation; and to be obedient, according to the dictates of goſpel grace, is ſalvation from ſin. There is juſt as much propriety in making obedience a condition, on which ſalvation is granted, as there would be for a phyſician to propoſe, to a patient in a fit of the aſthma, that he would afford relief, on condition the patient ſhould firſt breathe eaſy! However, if it be granted, that it is God's *will* that *all* men ſhould, finally, be holy and happy, I will more directly anſwer the ſuppoſition, that this *will* may fail, by the words of St. Paul; ſee Eph. i. 11. "In whom we alſo have obtained an inheritance, being predeſtinated, according to the purpoſe of him, who worketh *all things* after the *council* of his *own will*." If God will have all men to be ſaved, and worketh *all things* after the council of his *own will*, it proves that for which I contend, as fully as any thing can be proved from ſcripture. My opponent, perhaps, will ſay, (as many have ſaid to me in converſation) after meeting with much difficulty in arguing, "any thing may be proved, by ſcripture." To which, I reply, there is one thing, that the ſcriptures do not prove, neither can *all* the ingenuity of man make them ſubſtantiate it, and that is, the *endleſs miſery* of a *moral being*.

If any of my oppoſers can prove, by ſcripture, the *endleſs* duration of ſin and miſery, as plainly as the two paſſages above recited prove univerſal holineſs and happineſs, I will never contend any more, on the ſubject.

I will take further notice of Paul's communication to Timothy. He goes on, in the 5th and 6th verſes, to give Timothy a reaſon for what he had aſſerted; "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus, who gave himſelf a ranſom for *all*, to be teſtified in due time." The apoſtle's reaſoning is evidently good and plain; for God would not have given his Son a *ranſom* for *all*, if it were not his *will* that *all* ſhould be ſaved; and if it be God's *will*, it ought to be ours, therefore, it is right to *pray* for *all*. If the ranſom were paid for *all*, it argues, that it was the intention of the Ranſomer, that *all* ſhould be benefitted.

What would have been the aſtoniſhment of the world, after the immortal Waſhington had cauſed to be paid a ranſom for *all* the American priſoners who were in Algerine ſlavery, if he had told the Dey that he did not want more than one quarter of thoſe captives ſent home to the land of liberty and to the enjoyment of their families, for which they had ſo long ſighed in bondage; and that he might wear out the reſt with fatigue and whips? But the good man's ſoul was never ſatisfied until they *all* came home, and with ſongs of joyous liberty hailed the land of their nativity! And bleſſed be the Captain of our ſalvation; he, alſo, ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul and be ſatisfied, when *all* the "ranſomed of the Lord ſhall return and come to Zion, with ſongs and everlaſting joys upon

their heads, when they ſhall obtain joy and gladneſs, and ſorrow and ſighing ſhall flee away."

The reader's attention is now invited to thoſe ſcriptures which, in *expreſſion*, are more particularly applicable to the deliverance of mankind from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The whole of the 15th chapter of the 1ſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, was intended to refute thoſe who denied the reſurrection; but as that doctrine is not denied by my opponent, I ſhall take notice only of thoſe parts which affect the argument between us; ſee verſe 20. "But now is Chriſt riſen from the dead, and become the *firſt fruits* of them that ſlept." Chriſt, as the firſt fruits of them who ſlept, is repreſented by the heave-offering under the law. See Num. xv. 19, 20. "Then it ſhall be, that, when ye eat of the bread of the land, ye ſhall offer up an heave-offering unto the Lord. Ye ſhall offer up a cake of the firſt of your dough, for an heave-offering: as ye do the heave-offering of the threſhing floor, ſo ſhall ye heave it." Exodus xxii. 29. "Thou ſhalt not delay to offer the firſt of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors; the firſt born of thy ſons ſhalt thou give unto me." See, alſo, Num. xviii 15. By the offering of the firſt ripe fruits, the whole of the ſucceeding harveſt was ſanctified; and in the firſt born which were redeemed, the ſucceeding fruits of the womb were conſidered holy; ſee Acts xxvi. 23. "That Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and that he ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the dead." Chriſt being the firſt who roſe from the dead, and riſing as the firſt fruits, ſanctifies *all* the reſt, as did the firſt fruits under the law. St. Paul's comment on firſt fruits, is very illuſtrative of the ſcriptural meaning there-

of; ſee Rom. xi. 16. "For if the firſt fruits be holy, the lump is alſo holy; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches."

In the heave-offering under the law, there is a beautiful repreſentation of our Saviour. The ſheaf taken from the field, being ſeparated from *all* the reſt of the ſame growth, repreſents the ſeparation of Jeſus Chriſt from mankind to be holy unto the Lord; and the ſanctification of the whole harveſt being by the firſt ripe fruits, is to ſhew us, that our ſanctification is in Jeſus, the firſt fruits of them that ſlept. The ſame may be clearly ſeen, in the inſtance of the dough; a certain part of it was to be ſeparated from the reſt, for an offering unto the Lord, in which the remaining part of the *lump* (as the apoſtle calls it) was conſidered holy.

Theſe obſervations are made here, in order to draw the reader's attention more cloſely to the labors of the apoſtle, which we have under conſideration; for he goes on immediately to ſhow what he means, by the *lump* ſpoken of in Romans; ſee verſe 21. "For ſince by man came death, by man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead."

Let me here obſerve, that death came by the earthly man, and the reſurrection came by the heavenly man, which is in point to prove, that the plan of the goſpel is to deliver mankind from the earthly Adam, to the immortality of the heavenly.

Perhaps none would diſpute what I here contend for, provided I did not extend the cure as extenſive as the malady; but I ſhall alſo contend for this, and will clearly prove it by the apoſtle's teſtimony; ſee verſe 22. "For as in Adam *all die*, *even ſo in Chriſt*, ſhall *all* be made *alive*." It is not poſſible for me to ſtate the doctrine more *conciſe* and

positive than the apostle has done, in the passage quoted. But I am willing to attend to my opponent's objections as I proceed. He will say, he does not dispute that the apostle here meant *all* mankind, but that he only intended they would *all* be raised from the dead, not that *all* would be delivered from condemnation and sin. But I will rest my argument on the words themselves; I say, if *all* men are made *alive in* Christ, they cannot be said to be *out* of Christ dead, or alive, sinful, or holy.

The present state of our being is derived from Adam, the earthly nature; and, in a natural sense, we are *all in him.* Our future state of existence, we derive entirely from the heavenly nature; and, therefore, it is said, *all* shall be made alive in Christ. The apostle goes on still further, to show the order of the before mentioned work, arguing, from the *first fruits*, the *whole family of mankind.* See 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 25. "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down *all* rule, and *all* authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." Christ is here again spoken of as the first fruits, in the order of the resurrection, which consists of *three* parts.

First. Of Christ himself, who was the first that rose from the dead.

Secondly. Those who are Christ's at his coming, which coming, I will not endeavor to point out, as it makes nothing, in respect to the particular argument in which I am at present engaged.

Thirdly. The coming of the end, which cannot be, until he hath put down *all* rule, authority and power, and *every enemy* has ſubmitted; at which time, the Mediator delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father.

Then ſhall the great work of reconciliation be finiſhed, and the labors of the Redeemer completed, with immortal honor. Then ſhall *all* the millions of the human race be reconciled to God, through Chriſt, and ſhall ſing; ſee Rev. v. 11, 12, 13, 14. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beaſts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands; ſinging with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honor, and glory, and bleſſings. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and *all* that are in them, heard I, ſaying, Bleſſing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. And the four beaſts ſaid, amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down, and worſhipped him that liveth forever and ever."

The reader will obſerve, that ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands of *angels*, *beaſts* and *elders*, firſt declare the Lamb, who had been ſlain, to be worthy to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honor, and glory, and bleſſings; then *every* creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and *all* that are in them, ſay, Bleſſing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him who ſitteth upon the throne,

and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. Then the elders and beafts, who firft pronounced him thus worthy, fell down and worfhipped him who liveth forever and ever.

There is nothing, in all the facred writings, more aftonifhingly beautiful, than this account; neither do I think it poffible for the imagination to paint any thing half fo grand and fublime. I am all aftonifhment! To realize, by faith, the accomplifhment of this glorious prediction, tranfcends every other thought, or idea, of which the mind is fufceptible.

There is no room for my opponent to argue, againft the doctrine of univerfal holinefs and happinefs, while this paffage of divine truth lies in fight. There are no expreffions left out of this paffage that would make it more extenfive.

May I not afk my oppofer if he be not willing to acknowledge what myfterious powers have acknowledged, that Chrift, the dear Lamb who hath been flain, is worthy to receive as extenfive worfhip as is declared in the paffage quoted?

When the four beafts and the elders faw univerfal nature bending before the object of their worfhip, they immediately fell down, anxious to excel, and worfhipped him who liveth forever and ever. If my opponent think Chrift is not worthy of fo much worfhip, he thinks lefs of him than *I* do, and lefs than I wifh *he* did.

There are yet remaining many paffages in the xvth of Corinthians, which are in point, to prove what I am contending for, even more than is, at this time, neceffary to introduce. A few more, however, may be proper, with fome few remarks. See verfe 28. "And when all things fhall be fubdued unto him, then fhall the Son alfo himfelf be

ſubject to him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

What muſt we underſtand, by all thing being *ſubdued* unto him? Will any one ſay, all that is meant by it, is, Chriſt will then have power over *all* men, whereby he can reward the righteous, and torment the wicked? When did he not poſſeſs this power? When were not all things in ſubjection to Chriſt, enough for thoſe purpoſes? The ſubjection of all things to Chriſt, muſt mean ſomething, and it is reaſonable to believe, that it means the reconciliation of the heart to holineſs. Can a ſoul in ſin, employed in blaſpheming the Incommunicable Name, be ſaid to be in ſubjection to Chriſt, in any way that anſwers to the text? I do not think any will contend for it.

The only ſubjection which is acceptable to Chriſt, is a broken and contrite heart, which he will not deſpiſe. The plan, then, of the goſpel, is univerſal ſubmiſſion to Chriſt, in holineſs and happineſs.

The delivery of the kingdom of Chriſt to the Father is declared, in the laſt clauſe of the paſſage quoted, of which I have before taken notice, in this work, in order to ſhow the dependance of Chriſt on the Eternal and Self-exiſtent. Then, it is ſaid, "God ſhall be *all* in *all*." In what ſenſe will God be *all* in *all*, at the cloſe of the Redeemer's proceſs that he is not now, or always was? Anſwer, he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. When *all* men are brought to love God ſupremely, and their fellow creatures as themſelves, it will then be manifeſt, that we are nothing only as we exiſt in God; therefore, God will be *all*. And as the eternal ſpirit of love, which is the governing principle of the heavenly man, will be

the governing principle of each ſoul thus reconciled to the law of love, it may juſtly be ſaid that God is *in all.* See verſes 47, 48, 49. "The firſt man is of the earth, earthy; the ſecond man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, ſuch are they alſo that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, ſuch are they alſo that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we ſhall alſo bear the image of the heavenly." As we have all been partakers of the earthy Adam, ſo the apoſtle argues, we ſhall be partakers, in the reſurrection, of the Second Adam, whom he calls the Lord from heaven. See verſes 51, 52, 53, 54, "Behold, I will ſhew you a myſtery; we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall *all* be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the laſt trump; for the trumpet ſhall ſound, and the dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and we ſhall be changed. For this corruptible ſhall put on incorruption, and this mortal muſt put on immortality. So when this corruptible ſhall have put on incorruption, and this mortal ſhall have put on immortality, then ſhall be brought to paſs the ſaying that is written, death is ſwallowed up in victory."

If death, ſin and ſorrow, are to remain, as long as God exiſts, how can it be ſaid, death is ſwallowed up in victory? If the apoſtle believed any part of the family of man would finally be excluded from the bleſſings of the goſpel, why did he not juſt hint ſomething of it, in this account of the cloſe of the Mediatorial kingdom? Did he conſider it a matter of *too ſmall moment* to *mention?* If he *did*, he is *inexcuſable* for precluding the idea, by *plain* and *poſitive teſtimony.* See his concluſion, "O death! where is thy ſting? O grave! where is thy victory? The ſting of death is ſin; and the

ſtrength of ſin is the law. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt." If ſin remain without end, it being the *ſting* of death, when the queſtion is aſked, O death, where is thy *ſting?* Sin may anſwer, here I am, and here I will be, in ſpite of him who undertook to deſtroy the works of the devil, and here I will boaſt of my power as long as he does of his, whom angels adore, and I hate! Phil. iii. 21. "Who ſhall change our vile body, that it may be faſhioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able *even* to ſubdue *all things* unto himſelf." Obſerve, who ſhall change our vile body. In a former quotation, it is ſaid, "we ſhall *all* be changed;" and in the preſent paſſage, it is ſaid, "whereby he is able even to ſubdue *all things* unto himſelf." In a former quotation, it is ſaid, "And when *all things* ſhall be *ſubdued* unto him."

Let us hear what our bleſſed Lord himſelf ſays, in reſpect to his miſſion. St. John v. 22, 23. "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that *all* men ſhould *honor* the *Son*, even as they *honor* the *Father*. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, which hath ſent him." In the ſenſe in which this paſſage was ſpoken, it is evident, that the ſinner does neither honor the Father, nor the Son, and the plain teſtimony of the text is, that *all men* ſhould honor both. Compare this with Philip. ii. 9, 10, 11. "Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above *every* name; that at the name of Jeſus, every knee ſhould bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord,

to the glory of God the Father." As, in the other paſſage, the exaltation of the Saviour is firſt ſpoken of, and then the grand intention, in his exaltation, ſhown; ſo in this; there, it is for the purpoſe that *all* men ſhould honor him; and here, it is, that unto him, every knee ſhould bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Of this glorious and ſoul-reviving truth, the prophet Iſaiah was not ignorant, but ſpeaks of it moſt clearly; ſee chap. xlv. 22, 23, 24, 25. "Look unto me, and be ye ſaved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none elſe. I have ſworn by myſelf, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteouſneſs, and ſhall not return, that unto me every knee ſhall bow, every tongue ſhall ſwear. Surely, ſhall ſay, in the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength: *even* to him ſhall come; and all that are incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed. In the Lord ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory." The reader will obſerve, I have left out ſome ſupplied words, in the above quotation, by which, the paſſage reads without ambiguity.

Had the inſpired prophet been poſſeſſed of an accurate knowledge of the diſpute in which I am engaged, I do not ſee how he could have written a ſentence more pertinently to my argument; and I have not a doubt but the Spirit intended the paſſage for the ſame purpoſe for which I have uſed it.

St. Paul, in the viiith of Romans, ſhows the extent of redemption in ſo ſtrong terms as to ad-

mit of no poſſible evaſion ; ſee verſes 22, 23. "For we know that the *whole creation* groaneth, and travelleth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourſelves alſo, which have the firſt fruits of the Spirit, even we ourſelves groan within ourſelves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

If the reader will be at the trouble of examining this paſſage, with its connexion, that, for which I contend, will appear plainly proved by it.

There is no end to proofs of univerſal reconciliation to God ; for every thing of a moral nature teſtifies it, and all material nature is a figure of it. The miniſtry of reconciliation, which, St. Paul ſays, was committed to himſelf and others, is, that God was in Chriſt reconciling the *world* unto himſelf, not imputing unto them their treſpaſſes. The truth of Chriſt's dying for *all* is the foundation of the apoſtle's argument on this ſubject ; which truth the apoſtle ſays, he was conſtrained to believe, by the love of Chriſt ; for thus ſaith he, "The love of Chriſt conſtraineth us ; becauſe we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead ; and that he died for *all*, that they which live, ſhould not henceforth live unto themſelves, but unto him which died for them, and roſe again," 2 Cor. v. 14. &c.

I may as well ſtop here as any where, for, as I juſt ſaid, there is no end ; and if thoſe ſcriptures, which I have quoted, be true, that, which I have endeavored to prove, is proved ; but if they be not, more of the ſame teſtimony would prove nothing.

There is but one method left for my opponent, by which he can further oppoſe me ; and that is by denying the whole ſyſtem of divine revelation,

and man's ſuſceptibility of rational ideas: But as that would equally deſtroy all for which he would contend, he will undoubtedly be cautious.

We now ſee clearly, that it is God's will, according to his eternal purpoſe, purpoſed in himſelf, that *all* men ſhould finally be *holy* and *happy;* that it was the intention of the Saviour's miſſion; that the prophets, by the ſpirit of prophecy, long foreſaw this univerſal and godlike glorious plan of grace; that every good principle in man ſtands up in teſtimony of ſo divine a ſyſtem, that the happineſs of all moral beings is wrapped up in the glorious iſſue of the miniſtration of reconciliation, and that it is, in reality, oppoſed by none, but by *unreconciled* beings, unholy principles, and unlawful deſires. And ſhall we ſay, the eternal good will of him who dwelt in the buſh, muſt fail at laſt? Muſt the teſtimony of the prophets fall to the ground? Muſt the Captain of our ſalvation, who warred in righteouſneſs, who reddened his garments in his own blood, who bore the ſins of the world, and ſuffered death, in agony, to obtain his lawful inheritance, be robbed of them at laſt? Were this believed in heaven, the royal diadem would fall from the head of him whom all heaven adores, and the higheſt arch angel would faint away! But bleſſed be the Lord, and bleſſed be his truth, its divine power ſhall cauſe the Leviathan of infidelity to bite the ground, ſhall rend the veil which is caſt over all nations, and ſhall more and more manifeſt divine righteouſneſs and the name in which it is found, in which name alone is ſalvation. In the days of the apoſtles, the greateſt object in preaching the goſpel of Chriſt, was to prove him to be the Saviour of the world, the true Meſſiah of the law, urging, that he died

for *all*, that he made no diſtinction between Jew and Gentile, but had broken down the partition-wall between them, for the glorious purpoſe of making, of the *twain*, *one new man* in everlaſting fellowſhip and eternal peace. But how hath the gold changed, how hath the moſt fine gold become dim! The main apparent object, at the preſent day, is to prove the object of the Saviour's miſſion, as it reſpects the ſalvation of ſinners, extremely limited, and that but few of the human race will finally be the redeemed of the Lord to the praiſe of his glory; that the great adverſary of righteouſneſs will obtain a much larger conqueſt of ſouls than Chriſt himſelf; and, O, ſhocking to name, eternal juſtice is profaned, by being called to aſſiſt the ſerpent's deſigns, in the endleſs duration of ſin and rebellion againſt God! Thoſe, whom the Lord hath bleſſed with a belief of univerſal holineſs and happineſs, are proſcribed as heretics, infidels, offscourings of the earth, friends to nothing but ſin, and enemies to nothing but *God* and *holineſs*; opening a door to licentiouſneſs of every abominable ſpecies, deſtroyers of the pure religion of Chriſt, and nuiſances to ſociety. But is it, in reality, manifeſting a love to ſin, to argue its total deſtruction, by the power of divine righteouſneſs? Is it manifeſting enmity againſt God and the religion of Jeſus, to contend for the propriety of all men's ſerving him, in *holineſs* and *happineſs?* And are we nuiſances to ſociety, becauſe we endeavor to perſuade all men to love God and one another? Can theſe things be diſpleaſing to him who was born in Bethlehem? Will he not rather greatly bleſs ſuch labors, though performed by thoſe as little eſteemed in the world

as were the poor fiſhermen who left their nets, and followed the deſpiſed Nazarene?

Let us aſk a few queſtions. Which reflects the moſt honor on the Divine character, to contend, it was neceſſary for him to create millions of rational creatures, to hate him, and every divine communication he makes to them, to all eternity, to live in endleſs rebellion againſt him, and endure inconceivable torments, as long as God exiſts; or to ſuppoſe him able and willing to make all his rational creatures love and adore him, yield obedience to his divine law, and exiſt in union and happineſs with himſelf?

Which reflects moſt honor on the Saviour, to ſay, that but few will obtain ſalvation by him; and though he died for all men, yet, his death will benefit but few; or, to ſay, with the prophet, "He ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and be ſatisfied, having reconciled all things to God, through the peace made by the blood of the croſs?

If there be joy in heaven over one ſinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine juſt perſons who need no repentance, which would yield the moſt joy to the heavenly hoſts, the repentance of one fourth of mankind, or the whole? If the ſervants of Chriſt here on earth deſire the *increaſe* of *holineſs*, and the *decreaſe* of *ſin*, which would be moſt agreeable to ſuch a deſire, the belief, that the greateſt part of mankind will grow *more* and *more ſinful* to *all eternity*; or, to believe, that *ſin* will continually *decreaſe*, and *righteouſneſs increaſe*, until the *former* is wholly *deſtroyed*, and the *latter* becomes *univerſal*?

To anſwer the above queſtions, ſo as to favor my opponent's argument, is more than any one would be willing to do; and which, if done,

would involve an endleſs train of ideas too glaringly abſurd to be ſupported. But to anſwer them, agreeably to the nature of divine truth, opens to infinite beauties, more ſerene than the morning, and more glorious than the noon day. God, the fountain of living waters, and the eſſence of eternal life, is ſeen, by faith in Jeſus, the ſame to all rational beings, the author, ſupporter and bleſſer of them. Chriſt Jeſus, the head of every man, is beheld as the brightneſs of the Father's glory, and expreſs image of his perſon, through whom the Eternal hath manifeſted the riches of his grace, the eternal councils of his love to the world, brought life and immortality to light, and manifeſted our eternal ſonſhip in the Second Adam. Each holy deſire, as the fruit of the Spirit, in the ſouls of thoſe who believe, feaſts on the rich promiſes of Abraham's God, believing him faithful who hath promiſed. Heaven hath already received the heave offering of the firſt ripe fruits, and the fields are white, ready to harveſt. O, ye laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, be ye not idle. What an extenſive field is here in which for the mind to expand and ſend its deſires abroad! The tranſcendant beauties of ſalvation have viſited the dark regions of mortality, as light and heat from the vernal ſun viſits the cold and dark north, turning frozen lands into fruitful fields, taking the icy fetters from limpid ſtreams which bend their courſe to the fountain, bringing the time of the ſinging of birds, and cauſing the voice of the turtle to be heard.

"I am come," ſays Jeſus, "to ſend a fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?" All the paſſages, which allude to a diſpenſation of fire, which I have obſerved, in this work, are di-

rect evidences, to prove the deſtruction of ſin and all ſinful works, the purification of ſinners, and their eternal reconciliation to holineſs and happineſs. This fire will either overcome ſin, or be overcome by it: But who will argue the latter? If none, then let the former be acknowledged. If you ſay, theſe things appear differently from what you expected they would, before your inquiry, and you find ſomething more intereſting than tradition has taught you; if you feel ſoft, in your mind, towards the ſo much deſpiſed doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs; if you can believe heaven large enough to contain mankind, and begin to breathe in the air of unbounded benevolence, and feel faith mingled with your deſires for the deſtruction of ſin, and the increaſe of holineſs, then come ſtill further. The knowledge of theſe things is *progreſſive*, and *obtained only by degrees*. I give you my hand, in token of love and friendſhip; and my heart in all faithfulneſs, is yours. Let us ſtill go on and view the heavenly beauties yet to be unfolded, in the plan of the goſpel. I well know there are many difficulties to be ſurmounted; to profeſs univerſal ſalvation, will ſubject ſome to excommunication from regular churches; others to the pain of being neglected by their neighbors; others to be violently oppoſed by their companions; and, in many inſtances, undoubtedly, the father will be againſt the ſon, and the ſon againſt the father; the mother againſt the daughter, and the daughter againſt the mother; and a man's enemies may be thoſe of his own houſe: But can ſuch difficulties excuſe us for not owning him, who, for us, bore the croſs and deſpiſed the ſhame? All denominations, ſince the world began, have experienced ſome difficulties in

their firſt eſtabliſhment. Chriſt and his apoſtles wreſtled hard, and encountered great oppoſition, even to the loſs of all earthly things, with life itſelf. Since the apoſtacy, the denominations which aroſe out of Popery, have, in thouſands of inſtances, ſuffered more than duty calls us to ſuffer, in a land of liberty and toleration. But ſome will ſay, there are none who profeſs the doctrine in my vicinity, except ſome of the lower claſs of people; and if I rank myſelf with them, my titles of honor will do me no good, and my road to the temple of fame will be forever intercepted. Some will ſay to themſelves, I muſt believe the doctrine, I cannot argue againſt it, but I will ſay nothing about it, leſt I ſhould be miſtruſted; I would gladly embrace the opportunity which Nicodemus did, who went to Jeſus by night; but to come out boldly, to the knowledge of the world, is too great a ſacrifice. Says another, I am convinced of the truth of the doctrine, but I have preached ſo much againſt it, have warned my hearers ſo much to ſhun that hereſy, I am now aſhamed to tell them I believe it. Another feels ſo dependent on his neighbors, he wiſhes to have them go forward firſt. All theſe circumſtances, and many more, bear great weight with various perſons, in various circumſtances, cauſing great labor of mind; and thoſe who are under ſuch influences may be ſaid to be heavy ladened. I know of no better remedy for thoſe caſes, than an attention to the exhortation of Chriſt, who ſaid, "Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you reſt; take my yoke upon you, learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and you ſhall find reſt unto your ſouls; for my yoke is eaſy, and my burden is light."

The reader may judge, from thoſe circumſtances, whether this doctrine be pleaſing to the carnal mind, as its enemies ſay. Was it pleaſing to the phariſees of old, to be taught, by Chriſt and his diſciples, that publicans and harlots ſhould enter the kingdom of heaven before them? Yes, juſt as pleaſing to their carnal minds, as it is to a profeſſed preacher of Chriſt, who can thank God that he is better than other men, to tell him that thoſe, upon whom he looks as much viler than himſelf, ſtand in no more need of pardon than he does. St. Paul, before his converſion to chriſtianity, undoubtedly looked on the doctrine of Chriſt to be exactly calculated to pleaſe wicked men, as the moſt part of thoſe who were diſcipled by it, were publicans and ſinners; and he well knew, that the *foundation* of their *hope* was the *forgiveneſs* of *ſin*. This he deſpiſed, as did many of his equals in the Jewiſh religion; feeling themſelves whole, they felt no need of a phyſician. They ſuppoſed the goſpel to be a doctrine every way calculated to vitiate and immoralize mankind. Undoubtedly the phariſees often ſaid, of the diſciples of Chriſt, their religion is perfectly ſuited to their characters; they are ſinners, and know not the law; and they have contrived a *very eaſy way* to get to heaven. But if we aſk St. Paul, after his converſion, what he thought of theſe things, he would undoubtedly give a very different account. For when the Lord met him in the way, and gave him to underſtand his real character, and what he was doing; he was aſtoniſhed, and fell to the earth; his ſins were ſet in order before him, and his ſoul was greatly troubled. In this ſituation, he learned the neceſſity of the doctrine which he had diſpiſed; experienced the neceſſity of its par-

doning mercy; and became as willing to endure perſecution, for its ſake, as he had been to perſecute it before.

When it is underſtood, that goſpel ſalvation is ſalvation from carnal mindedneſs and all its relative ills, to a reconciliation to the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus; if all men were thus ſaved, it would not be argued, that it is pleaſing to the carnal mind. As the doctrine for which I contend, is entirely the reverſe of carnal mindedneſs, ſo it is equally oppoſed to licentiouſneſs; for what can be a ſtronger reſtraint on the paſſions than a belief in God's univerſal goodneſs, and that all men are the objects of his mercy? Such a belief, when it has its proper effects in the mind, raiſes a ſupreme affection for God, and kindles the ſacred fire of love and unbounded benevolence to mankind. If any would diſpute me, on my ſtatement of the conſequences of this faith, I have greatly the advantage; as my opponent does not poſſeſs this faith, he cannot tell the effects of it ſo well as one can who does. However, I will not make uſe of that advantage, having argument in my power that is more than ſufficient. Let my adverſary ſtate his argument, that we may ſee the ſtrength of it. The fact is, he has no argument; he can only *aſſert*, "the doctrine is not productive of love to God or man, but the reverſe; and if he believed it, he would commit every ſin that was in his power." Is it hard to ſee, that my opponent has made a very fair and full profeſſion of his love to ſin, in room of his love to God; and a ſtrong deſire to injure his fellow men, in room of ſerving them in love? What was the elder brother angry for? At what did he grumble? And why did he refuſe to go into his father's

houſe? Becauſe the father had received the prodigal, and treated him kindly. At what did the laborers grumble who bore the burden and heat of the day? Becauſe thoſe, who had wrought but one hour, received as much as they, and received their money firſt. At what did the phariſees and ſcribes murmur, when they ſaw all the publicans and ſinners come to Jeſus to hear him? Becauſe he did not condemn them to hopeleſs deſpair, but kindly received them. At what do my oppoſers rage? At what are they diſſatisfied? Not becauſe I exclude them from any privilege, or bleſſing of the goſpel. What, then? I am ſorry to name it. It is becauſe I extend thoſe bleſſings further, and hope they will do more good than what ſuits them!

As the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs opens an infinite field in which for the mind to expatiate, and learn the goodneſs of God in all his works and providence, it is the moſt animating to a benevolent ſoul of any that was ever believed, in our world, and lays the broadeſt foundation for exhortation to deny ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, to live ſober, righteous and godly lives. How ſtrong are the inducements, from ſuch glorious views of God and his mercy, to lead us to imitate ſuch unbounded goodneſs, in all our intentions and actions. And being fully convinced, that our happineſs is in union with our duty, thoſe who fully believe in the conſequences of atonement, as I have argued them, will ſee the propriety of my endeavoring to ſtir up their pure minds, by way of remembrance, exhorting them to good works in all faithfulneſs, in whatever ſituation duty may call us, or whatever

the part may be which our heavenly Father hath called us to act, in his divine and delightſome ſervice. The duty enjoined on the believer of this doctrine, is as much more extenſive than the duty enjoined by any other faith, as the faith itſelf is more extenſive; and its delights are ſo, likewiſe. If a poor man was offered a thouſand pounds for a day's labor, it would undoubtedly be a very ſtrong inducement to him to labor. But it is to be obſerved, in this caſe, that it is not the *labor itſelf* which is the object, but the *large ſum of money* with which the laborer expects to be rewarded. It is not the *labor* in which the man delights; could he obtain his *money*, without the *work*, it would be his choice. But when the *labor itſelf* is all the *enjoyment*, and the *whole object* is *obedience*, the laborer will not wiſh the *time ſhort*, or the *duty ſmall*; no, *eternity is none too long for the ſoul to contemplate laboring in the endleſs delights of obedience to his God.*

Thoſe, who believe a future ſtate of happineſs depends on certain duties performed by them, undoubtedly intend to do thoſe duties ſometime before they die; and it is often ſaid, that a procraſtination of thoſe duties, on which ſo much depends, is dangerous, as life is uncertain; yet, they had rather let it alone, until old age deprives them of the common comforts of life; at which time, they may about as well be employed in the *dull* and *diſagreeable taſk* of being *good* as any thing elſe. But thoſe, who conſider their duty as their meat and drink, ought not to need much inviting, to feed on dainties ſo rich. We ſhould hardly believe a man to be in his right mind, who, for eating a good meal of victuals, ſhould charge the price of it. "*In* keeping thy commandments, there is *great reward.*" By theſe obſervations, the

reader will ſee how needful it is for us, at all times, to attend to our duty, becauſe "*now* is the accepted time, and *now* is the day of ſalvation;" to every willing and obedient ſoul who feels the power of atoning grace, *ſalvation* is preſent: Truly it is ſaid of wiſdom, "She hath builded her houſe, ſhe hath hewn out her ſeven pillars: ſhe hath killed her beaſts; ſhe hath mingled her wine; ſhe hath alſo furniſhed her table." God, in infinite wiſdom, has conſtituted all moral beings ſo that their duty is their happineſs, and ſtrict obedience fulneſs of joy. Why, then, my brethren, ſhall we ſtarve? Why live poor? Why ſhould we be ſo parſimonious of thoſe heavenly ſtores that can never be exhauſted? "Bleſſed are they who hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs, for they ſhall be filled." "Aſk, and ye ſhall receive; ſeek, and ye ſhall find; knock, and it ſhall be opened unto you." God forbids none; "the Spirit and the bride ſay, come; and let him that heareth, ſay, come; and whoever will, let him take of the fountain of the water of life freely." Remember the ſalvation which God wills is a ſalvation *from ſin.* Then, as much as you deſire ſalvation, you will wiſh to avoid ſin and wickedneſs. There are none who would ſay, they did not want ſalvation; but how many are there who ſay, they want it by their own conduct! No man, underſtandingly, wants ſalvation, any further than he wants more holineſs. The univerſaliſt, who is really ſo, prizes his duty as his heaven, as his peace, and his moſt ſublime enjoyment. How then ſhall we be ſo loſt, ſo blind, and ſo deceived, as to wiſh to ſhun our duty and our happineſs? If we really believe thoſe things, and deſire that others may be brought to ſee and believe the ſame, let us endeavor, in the firſt place,

to prove to all men, that ſuch a belief is of real ſervice in cultivating our morals, and in regulating our behavior. And, ſecondly, by uſing our abilities as God hath given, in cool diſpaſſionate reaſoning, with thoſe who do not believe; contending for nothing but the pure principles of love, in meekneſs and all gentleneſs. Never argue for *will* ſake, nor for maſtery; and, ſhunning every appearance of *ſophiſtry*, never ſuffer yourſelves to be anxious about the iſſue of converſation; but ſpeak the words of truth and ſoberneſs, and leave the event to be directed by the ſpirit of God. Falſehood is ſo apt to detect itſelf, that an argument is generally beſt conducted, when the diſputant is refuted by conſequences ariſing from his own ſtatements; and if he cannot ſee and underſtand them for himſelf, it will do no good to ſee them for him. If we can ſee for ourſelves, we do well. If the Lord of the harveſt hath graciouſly been pleaſed to call you by his grace, to preach the word of his goſpel to his purchaſed poſſeſſion; to ſound abroad the trumpet of ſalvation, and to feed the ſheep and lambs of the one true ſhepherd, then remember, that it is required of ſtewards that they are found faithful. St. Paul declared himſelf a debtor both to the Greeks and Barbarians, to the wiſe and unwiſe. He having received a diſpenſation of the goſpel, the grace of which belonged to *all* men, he thereby became a debtor to *all*. And if we have received a diſpenſation of the ſame goſpel, we are debtors to all whom this goſpel concerns. How happy is a friend, who has good news to communicate to his companions; and ſurely it is an office much to be deſired to carry good news to the diſtreſſed. See the officer when he reads a

pardon to one who expects immediate death; his soul bursts through his eyes in streams of joy, while he pronounces the words which give life to the dead. But how much more excellent are the labors of those whose feet are beautiful on the mountains, who publish peace in the Redeemer's name, even glad tidings unto all people. Much watchfulness is necessary, lest the law of the carnal or old man gets the government of the mind. I will venture to say, there never was a preacher more ready, on all occasions, than the old man which we are exhorted to put off; he is willing, at all times, to assist, never waiting to be called. He has no objections to preaching *about* Christ, if *Christ* be not preached. He is perfectly willing to say, that *salvation* is *all* of *God*, and that Christ is a whole Saviour; but then it is indispensably necessary that *he* should do something; such as asking, seeking, knocking; or, if it be only *accepting* of *offered* mercy, it is all *he* wants. It may be, the reader will wonder a little at what I here say, as I have just quoted the exhortation, to ask, to seek, to knock, &c.; but I wish to be understood, that we must ask, seek and knock, not *in* the *name* or *nature* of the *earthly* Adam, but in the *name* and *nature* of the *heavenly* man. The old serpent, the devil, is never better pleased, than when he can do something which he thinks lays God under some obligation to him. If the carnal or old man get so baffled as to be reduced to give up his influence respecting our *eternal life* in *Jesus*, he will immediately propose, in his struggles, that all *he* can do, is to ensure a blessed state, for some considerable time after we die, say for a thousand years, or any given time; then all must depend on the Saviour. If the earthly Adam can get us

up Jacob's ladder a few ſteps, he is willing that Chriſt ſhould do ſomething by and by. Now the object of all thoſe devices, of which we are not ignorant, (as St. Paul ſays) is to keep us in the ſervice of the fleſh; but remember, he that *ſoweth* to the *fleſh*, ſhall of the *fleſh* reap *corruption*. A phariſee, who feels as if ſomething was coming to him more than others receive, perhaps will not be ſcrupulous about the exact quantity. He only wiſhes to have proper attention paid him; if he can flatter himſelf with a *higher ſeat* in *heaven* than thoſe are to have, on whom he looks as worſe than himſelf, it ſatisfies his carnal pride: Perhaps a period of puniſhment for ſinners, after death, in which they may be juſtly corrected, for not being ſo good and holy as this phariſee, would give him much ſatisfaction. He would then be willing to have the poor wretches delivered from abſolute miſery, and enjoy ſome ſmall conveniencies. O, how hard it is, to be a humble diſciple of the meek and lowly Jeſus. It is death to carnal mind. If I preach the goſpel all my life long, ſpend all my time and ſtrength for the good of mankind, and the honor of my Saviour, ſhall I not have ſomething more hereafter, than one who has mocked and derided me? Anſwer, if I have, in truth and meekneſs, preached Chriſt, and have been faithful in his cauſe, ought I not to be thankful, that he has enabled me ſo to do? Have I been the loſer, unleſs I am paid, in the world to come, by having ſome privilege granted me which another may not enjoy? O, bluſh, my ſoul, if thy follies riſe ſo high. No, every moment's faithfulneſs has been ſupplied with ſtreams of divine conſolation; and it ought to be remembered, that, the preacher never refreſhes others, unleſs he him-

ſelf is refreſhed. If I have profeſſed to preach Chriſt, but have preached myſelf, in room of him, undoubtedly I may think there is ſomething coming, as my living has been very poor, while I have thus laboured; but the truth is, my *reward* has been *equal* to my *ſervice*. I am willing to acknowledge, that *carnal mind* often contends, that I have done ſo well, I ought, in conſequence, to expect high approbations; and I begin to look *down* on thoſe whom I fancy of leſs magnitude. But, O, the viperous ſting! Well might an apoſtle ſay, "I find a law in my members warring againſt the law of my mind, bringing me into captivity to the law of ſin which is in my members." Says the ſame apoſtle, "Unto me, who am leſs than the leaſt of all ſaints, is this grace given, that I ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable riches of Chriſt." Upon what high advantages did he calculate, above thoſe who were much leſs in labor than himſelf? But, ſays the reader, will not St. Paul fare better than the worſt of ſinners, in eternity? Judge from what he ſays, "This is a faithful ſaying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Chriſt Jeſus came into the world to ſave *ſinners*, of whom *I* am *chief*." The more humble we are, the greater our enjoyments. But when all are completely humbled, and perfectly reconciled; when all old things are done away, and all things become new; when he, who ſitteth upon the throne, maketh all things new in deed and in truth, I believe all ſtrife, concerning who ſhall be great in the kingdom of heaven, will be at an end. Ye, who preach righteouſneſs in the great congregations of the people, forget not the exhortation of the Captain of our ſalvation, "*Learn of me*." What good will all our labors do,

unleſs we learn of Chriſt? If we learn of him, he will be unto us, wiſdom, righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption; and we ſhall preach, not ourſelves, but Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, and ourſelves the ſervants of the people, for Jeſus' ſake. Remember, again, the exhortation of him who is the leader and commander of the people, "Search the ſcriptures." Make yourſelves acquainted with, and have free recourſe to, this great ſtore-houſe of divine riches, that you may be ready to "deal a portion to ſeven, and alſo to eight." "Ye are the ſalt of the earth." As ſalt preſerves and ſeaſons meats, ſo that they are acceptable, ſo ought the miniſters of righteouſneſs to endeavor, as far as poſſible, to preſerve mankind from ſin, that they may be acceptable members of the church of Chriſt. "But if the ſalt have loſt its ſavor, wherewith ſhall it be ſalted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be caſt out and trodden under foot of men" We cannot be profitable to others, unleſs we have the ſavor of the Spirit within us; this loſt, and we are good for nothing; and in room of having a mouth, and wiſdom, to put gainſayers to ſilence, we ſhall be overcome by them, and they will tread us under their feet. "Contend earneſtly for the faith once delivered to the ſaints." But be ſure to remember, that, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but ſpiritual, and mighty through God." Carnal mind frequently urges the neceſſity of contending earneſtly for the faith once delivered to the ſaints; but then, we muſt contend in a coat of *mail*, and with the weapons of him who ſought the life of the *Son* of Jeſſe. Be prepared to meet every kind of oppoſition; we muſt be attacked on every ſide, the adverſary will not leave one ſtone unturned, nor a weapon in his armor, untried. Be cautious

of any ſyſtem of divinity; remember "the path of the juſt is a ſhining light, which ſhineth more and more unto the perfect day." The moment we fancy ourſelves *infallible*, every body muſt come to our peculiarities, or we caſt them away. Even the truth may be held in unrighteouſneſs. *Daniel's* God was undoubtedly the *true God*; but I do not conceive *Darius* any more the real friend of that *God*, when he made a decree that *all* people ſhould worſhip him, than he was when he made the decree, that no petition ſhould be aſked of any God or man, for thirty days, ſave of himſelf. The cauſe of truth wants nothing in its ſervice but the fruits of the Spirit, which are love, joy, peace, gentleneſs, goodneſs, faith, meekneſs and temperance. All the diviſions and ſubdiviſions which now exiſt among chriſtians, or ever have exiſted, were cauſed wholly for want of thoſe graces. Should we be tenacious about certain ſentiments and peculiarities of faith, the time is not far diſtant, when univerſaliſts, who have ſuffered every kind of contemptuous treatment, from the enemies of the doctrine, will be at war among themſelves, and be trodden under foot of the gentiles. Having begun in the Spirit, do not think to be made perfect by the fleſh. In order to imitate our Saviour, let us, like him, have compaſſion on the ignorant and thoſe whom we view to be out of the way. Attend to the exhortation, "Let brotherly love continue." If we agree in brotherly love, there is no diſagreement that can do us any injury; but if we do not, no other agreement can do us any good. Let us keep a ſtrict guard againſt the enemy "that ſows diſcord among brethren." Let us endeavor to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." May charity, that heaven-born companion of the human heart, never for-

ſake us; and may the promiſe of the Saviour be fulfilled concerning us, "Lo I am with you even unto the end of the world."

You have now, kind reader, caſt your eye over theſe pages; perhaps you feel to ſay, "the doctrine of univerſal holineſs and happineſs cannot be true, notwithſtanding all the author has ſaid in favor of it;" and if ſo, I condemn you not. The time has been, when I believed as little of the doctrine as you now do; I never adopted the belief of univerſal holineſs and happineſs out of *choice*, but from the *force* of *real* or *ſuppoſed evidence*. And I know you cannot believe it, on any other ground. I hope, however, you feel no enmity to ſo glorious a ſyſtem of God's grace; I hope you have the ſpirit of Chriſt, and wiſh well to mankind. I have, beſure, great conſolation in believing that my Redeemer has many faithful ſervants and loving diſciples in the world, who do not believe in the extenſiveneſs of ſalvation as I do, and I often take great ſatisfaction, in feaſts of charity, with ſuch brethren. St. Peter was undoubtedly a lover of Chriſt and his goſpel, before he was taught by the ſea of Joppa to call no man common or unclean. The reſt of the diſciples, who were diſſatisfied with his preaching the goſpel to the uncircumciſed, were doubtleſs poſſeſſed of the ſpirit of Chriſt, which cauſed them to glorify God when they had more extenſive views of the goſpel, through Peter's communications. As far as I ſee men walk in the ſpirit of love to God and one another, I feel an union with them, whether their particular ſentiments are mine, or not. Men cannot believe at will; we believe, as evidence appears to our mind. The times have been, when each denomination has been proſcribed, and, in

ſome meaſure, perſecuted. Each as it roſe has been cenſured by thoſe who could not fall in with their doctrine; and what does all this condemning one another prove, only the imperfections of all, and the badneſs of the human heart? You will not think evil of me, kind reader, if I exhort you not to feel too hard againſt what you may find to be your duty to acknowledge. It grieved Peter, when his Lord aſked him the third time, if he loved him, as he had denied him thrice. There are many univerſaliſts now who have frequent occaſion to confeſs how hard they have been againſt the doctrine, and how much they have ſpoken unadviſedly with their lips againſt what they now rejoice to believe is truth, and humbly adore the Saviour of ſinners for opening their eyes to behold ſuch unſpeakable beauties. If you attend to the exhortation, to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, undoubtedly you may ſee more of the riches of his goodneſs than you now do. The prophet Ezekiel's knowledge of the holy waters was progreſſive, and obtained by degrees: When he was firſt led into the waters, they were only to his ancles; but he went ſtill further, and they were to his knees; he went ſtill further, and they were to his loins; he went further, and the waters were *riſen*, waters for men to ſwim in, a *river* that no man could paſs. Had the prophet refuſed to travel in theſe waters, after he firſt entered them, he would not have known nor believed them to be ſo multitudinous as they were. A ſoul, in the earlieſt moments of heavenly love, is firſt unſpeakably charmed with the untold beauties and graces of his Redeemer; next, wife, children, father, mother, brothers, ſiſters, all friends, directly enemies, and

finally all mankind are embraced in the extended arms of heavenly love and divine benevolence.

I close this work, humbly hoping and expecting the glorious increase and extensive growth of what I have, (though feebly) contended for, viz. the holiness and happiness of mankind. I look, with strong expectation, for that period, when all sin, and every degree of unreconciliation will be destroyed, by the divine power of that love which is stronger than death, which many waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown; in which alone I put my trust, and in which my hope is anchored for all mankind; earnestly praying, that the desire of the righteous may not be cut off.

The fulness of times will come, and the times of the restitution of all things will be accomplished. Then shall truth be victorious, and all error flee to eternal night. Then shall universal songs of honor be sung to the praise of him who liveth forever and ever. All death, sorrow and crying, shall be done away; pains and disorders shall be no more felt, temptations no more trouble the lovers of God, nor sin poison the human heart. The blessed hand of the once crucified shall wipe tears from off all faces. O, transporting thought! Then shall the blessed Saviour see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied, when, through his mediation, universal nature shall be brought in perfect union with truth and holiness, and the spirit of God fill all rational beings. Then shall the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which maketh free from the law of sin, become the governing principle of the whole man once made subject to vanity, once inthraled in darkness, sin and misery; but then, delivered from the bondage of corruption, and restored to perfect reconciliation to God,

in the heavenly Adam. Then ſhall the great object of the Saviour's miſſion be accompliſhed. Then ſhall the queſtion be aſked, O death, where is thy ſting? But death ſhall not be, to give the anſwer. And, O grave, where is thy victory? But the boaſter ſhall be ſilent. The Son ſhall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father; the eternal radiance ſhall *ſmile*, and GOD *ſhall be* ALL *in* ALL.

Mr. Ballou's Works.

THE following works of the Rev. *Hosea Ballou*, Pastor of the Universalist Church and Society in Portsmouth, may be had, wholesale and retail, at the Book-store of CHARLES PEIRCE, No. 5, Daniel-street, Portsmouth, N. H.

Notes on the Parables of the New Testament, by Hosea Ballou, The Second Edition, Scripturally illustrated and argumentatively defended.

Price 1 dollar.

A Treatise on the Atonement, in which the Finite nature of Sin is argued; its causes and consequences as such; the necessity and nature of Atonement; and its glorious consequences in the Final Reconciliation of all men to holiness and happiness — *Price 1 dollar.*

A Candid Review of a Pamphlet entitled a Candid Reply; the whole being a Doctrinal Controversy between a Hopkintonian and Universalist. *Price 75 cents.*

The Child's Scriptural Catechism.

Price 12½ cents single.

Hymns composed by different authors, at the request of the General Convention of Universalists, of the New-England States and others; adapted to public and private devotion.— *Price 75 cents.*

May also be had at C. Peirce's Book-store,

A Series of Letters between Dr. Buckminster, Rev. Joseph Walton, and the Rev. Hosea Ballou; all Ministers of Portsmouth, differing more or less in Religious Sentiments.—*Price 50 cents bound and lettered.*

☞ If a number subscribe, or join in company, and buy ten of any of the above books, the eleventh will be given *gratis*.

Winchester's Lecture on the Prophecies, in 2 vols.—*Price 25/6.*

Winchester's Universal Restoration exhibited in four dialogues.—*Price 5/3 each.*

Petitpierre on Divine Goodness, relative to the Government of moral agents.—*Price 1 dollar.*

Dr. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, in 6 vols.

Dr. Milner's History of the Church of Christ from the first century, in 5 vols.

Dr. Campbell's Four Gospels, translated from the Greek, with Preliminary Dissertations and Notes Critical and Explanatory, in 4 vols.

Dr. Campbell's Lectures on Systematic Theology and pulpit Eloquence, 1 vol.

Dr. Macknight's new literal translation from the Original Greek, of all the Apostolic Epistles: with a Commentary and Notes, &c. in 6 vols.

Dr. Faber on the prophecies, 1 vol. octavo.

Dr. Jamieson's use of Sacred History in illustrating and Confirming the Great Doctrines of Revelation 1 vol.

Butterworth's, Cruden's, Taylor's, and Brown's Concordances to the Holy Scriptures.

Brown's and Buck's Theological Dictionaries. 2 volumes each.

Orton's Exposition of the Old, and Doddridge of the New Testament 6 vols. each.

Adams' View of all the Denominations in the world, and of the different schemes of religion now embraced among mankind. *Price* 2 dollars and 50 cents.

Evans's Sketch of the Denominations into which the Christian World is divided. Price 62½ cents

Butler's Analogy of Religion, natural and revealed. Second American edition, with the author's life. *Price 2 dollars 25 cents.*

Fraſer's Key to the Prophecies of the Old and New Teſtament, which are not yet accompliſhed. *Price* 2 50.

Weſt's Letters to a Young Man, on his firſt entrance into Life. *Price* 1 *dollar and* 25 *Cents.* (Good.)

Weſt's Letters to a Young Lady, in which the Duties and Characters of Women are conſidered, chiefly with a reference to prevailing opinions. *Price* 2 *dollars.* (Excellent.)

Pike and Hayward's religious Caſes of conſcience, anſwered in an evangelical manner; to which is added,

The Spiritual Companion; the character of the Happy Man, &c. *Price* 1 *dollar and* 50 *cents.* (Excellent.)

Eleven Select Sermons of the great Saurin, bound in 1 Vol. *Price* 1 *dollar.*

Scott's Force of Truth, an authentic Narrative. *Price* 62½

Scott's Vindication of the Divine Inſpiration of the Holy Scriptures. *Price* 75 *cents.*

Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progreſs; Grace abounding to the Chief of Sinners, Come and welcome to Jeſus Chriſt.—Law and grace unfolded.

Minor Works, containing Chriſt a complete Saviour; Solomon's Temple Spiritualized; Water of Life, &c.

Booth's Abbadie, being a Treatiſe on the divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. *Price* 1 *Dollar.*

Booth's Reign of Grace, from its riſe to its conſummation. *Price* 1 *Dollar.*

Watt's Glory of Chriſt as God-Man diſplayed. *Price* 1 25.

Berkley's Minute Philoſopher. *Price* 2 *dollars.*

Bielby's Evidences of the Chriſtian Revelation.

Baxter's Saints Reſt, and Call to the Unconverted.

Witherſpoon's Miſcellanies.

Edwards' on Redemption and on the Religious Affections.

BIBLES of almoſt every deſcription from a ſmall School Bible to a large folio.

The foregoing works, together with an extenſive aſſortment of other Books, may alſo be had at the Bookſtore of ISAAC PEIRCE, in Philadelphia, on as good terms as at any ſtore in America.

☞ Public and Private Libraries ſuplied on reaſonable terms.

JUN 4 1936